BERTRAM
OR
RATRAM
Concerning the
BODY and BLOOD
OF THE
LORD,
In LATIN;
With a New Engliſh Tranſlation.
To which is Prefix'd,
An Hiſtorical Diſſertation touching the Author and this Work.

The Second Edition Corrected, and Enlarged with an
APPENDIX:
WHEREIN
Monſieur *Boileau*'s French Verſion, and Notes upon *BERTRAM* are Conſidered, and his Unfair Dealings in both Detected.

LONDON,
Printed by *H. Clark*, for *Thomas Boomer*, at the *Chirurgeons-Arms* in *Fleetſtreet*, near *Temple-Bar*, 1688.

~~BERTRAM~~

OR

~~RATRAM~~

Imprimatur,

Liber Ratramni *de Corpore & Sanguine Domini cum Versione Anglica & Præfatione secundum hoc Exemplar ab Interprete recognitum cum Appendice.*

Oct. 6. 1687. H. Maurice, *Rmo. in Christo P. D.* Willielmo *Archiepiscopo* Cant. *a Sacris.*

~~APPENDIX:~~

R. Ratramnus Corbeiensis Monac

BERTRAM
OR
RATRAM
Concerning the
BODY and BLOOD
OF THE
LORD,
In LATIN;
With a New Engliſh Tranſlation.
To which is Prefix'd,
An Hiſtorical Diſſertation touching the Author and this Work.

The Second Edition Corrected, and Enlarged with an
APPENDIX:
WHEREIN
Monſieur *Boileau*'s French Verſion, and Notes upon *BERTRAM* are Conſidered, and his Unfair Dealings in both Detected.

LONDON,
Printed by *H. Clark*, for *Thomas Boomer*, at the *Chirurgeons-Arms* in *Fleetſtreet*, near *Temple-Bar*, 1688.

Amplissimo Viro,
Generis, Eruditionis & Virtutis
Omnigenæ Ornamentis
Præmobili,
HENRICO COVENTRY
Armigero,
Serenissimo Regi JACOBO II.
uti pridem
Fratri Charissimo CAROLO II.
A Privatis Consiliis:
Cui etiam Optimo Principi
Ob Fidem Patri & Sibi, nec non
S. Matri Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ,
In adversis fortiter servatam,
Ob munera in S. Palatio honorifica
Egregie [illegible]
Ob res ardua [illegible] exteros
Legatis [illegible]
Summa Fidelitate, [illegible] Prudentia,
Pariqne felicitate
Gestas
Apprime Charus extitit
Secretariusq; Primicerius;
Hoc

Ampliſſimo Viro,
Generis, Eruditionis & Virtutis
Omnigenæ Ornamentis
Prænobili,
HENRICO COVENTRY
Armigero,
Sereniſſimo Regi JACOBO II.
uti pridem
Fratri Chariſſimo CAROLO II.
A Privatis Conſiliis:
Cui etiam Optimo Principi
Ob Fidem Patri & Sibi, nec non
S. Matri Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ,
In adverſis fortiter ſervatam,
Ob munera in S. Palatio honorifica
Egregie defuncta.
Ob res arduas variis apud exteros
Legationibus
Summa Fidelitate, Singulari Prudentia,
Parique felicitate
Geſtas
Apprime Charus extitit
Secretariuſq; Primicerius;
Hoc

Hoc Opusculum
Ratramni Corbeiensis
De S. Eucharistia,
Fidei Veteris Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ
Testis luculenti,
Nec non
Nostræ vere Catholicæ Anglicanæ
Vindicis Eximii,
Una cum Versione Vernacula
& Dissertatione præmissa
In Testimonium
Obsequii & Gratitudinis
I. M. Q. D. D. D. Q.
V. V. H. S. A. E. P. R.
Editor.

THE PREFACE.

IT is now seven Years and more, since I first read over this little Piece of Bertram *in Latin, and the Satisfaction I had to see so Learned a Writer expresly confute the Error of Transubstantiation, at its first rise in the Western Church, invited me to a second and third Reading, and the Book not being very common, I entertained thoughts of Reprinting it, both in* Latin *and* English; *for remembring where I had seen an English* Bertram, *Published by Sir* Humphrey Lynd, *A. D.* 1623. *I promised my self, that Publishing it in* English, *would add but little to my trouble, not suspecting that a*

Tranſlation publiſhed by that Learned Gentleman, could have been other than accurate. I therefore got together as many various Editions of the Book as I could, and ſent for the Engliſh Verſion, upon ſight of which I ſaw my ſelf diſappointed. For there are ſome Miſtakes in rendring the Latin words, *two of which may be ſeen in the Preface. For Inſtance,* Catholice Sapere, *is Tranſlated* to be univerſally Wiſe, *which ſhould have been rendred* to be Orthodox, *or* Catholick in his Judgment; *and again,* Non æquanimiter iſta perpendens *is rendred (though perhaps not quietly and indifferently conſidering of theſe things) inſtead of ſadly laying to heart theſe things,* [viz. *the Schiſm on occaſion of the new Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.*] *And ſeveral other ſlips of that kind, I obſerved, which made me gueſs the Tranſlation could not be the work of the worthy Knight, who recommended it to the Publick. But had this been*

all,

all, a little time and pains might have rectified those Miſtakes. That which rendred the Tranſlation unſerviceable to me, was the perplexity of the ſtyle, through unneceſſary Parentheſes, and the multiplying of Synonimous words; and in ſome places by rendring the Author too much word for word, ſo that it doth not give the Reader a clear apprehenſion of the Author's ſenſe. And to juſtifie this charge, I need only refer the Reader to the ninth and tenth Pages of the new Impreſſion of Bertram, *where he proves that Conſecration makes no Phyſical change in the Bread and Wine; but as he is there Tranſlated, his reaſoning is hardly intelligible.*

Yet, I accuſe not the Tranſlator of unfaithfulneſs, but freely acknowledge, that had his skill been equal to his Fidelity, I would have uſed his Verſion, and ſaved my ſelf the trouble of a new one, which I made and tranſcribed in Septem. 1681.

Having

Having finished my Translation, I proceeded to collect materials for the Dissertation I intended, which I cast into loose Papers, and desiring a Learned Friend to assist me, with what he knew on that Subject, he put into my hands an Edition I had not before met with, in French *and* Latine, *with a Learned Advertisement prefixed, in which I found the Work designed by me, was already very well performed, so that my Labour might be spared. Thus I laid aside my Papers, and all thoughts of making them publick, till about two Months since, and then resumed them, upon the request of some worthy Friends, who judged it necessary, since the Reprinting of the former Translation. Besides, the faults of the Translator, in the new Impression there are great ones committed by the Printer, in the* Technical words *of the Discourse, particularly in the beginning of the Eleventh Page, he hath printed* Verity *instead of* Variety. *At the desire*

fire of those Gentlemen I assisted to Review and Print my Translation with the Authors Text, that the Reader might have it in his Power to judge of my Fidelity therein. And though I see no reason to be proud of my performance, yet I perswade my self this Book will be somewhat more useful, than that which now goes abroad.

In the Dissertation prefixed, I have Collected all the little Historical Passages I have met with any where, touching our Author and his Works, and perhaps the Reader may think, I insist too long upon some matters of no great moment. But in regard Ratramnus was an extraordinary Man, and no Body, that I know, hath in our Language, given any considerable account of him, and his Writings, I thought it would not be altogether unacceptable to the Reader.

Though the French Advertisement be exceedingly well done, yet I have had great helps, for the clearing

ing

ing the Antiquity and Authority of that Tract, which the Author of that Advertiſement wanted. To mention no other, the moſt Learned and Ingenuous Father Mabillon *(to whom I acknowledge my ſelf obliged for my beſt Informations) had not then publiſhed the Acts of the Benedictines of the IX Century, in which our Author lived. What I deſign in my Diſſertation, the Contents of each Chapter will inform the Reader.*

I ſhall only add, that my deſign is not to engage in the Controverſie of Tranſubſtantiation, which is ſo compleatly handled, and clearly diſcuſſed, by the Learned and Reverend Author, of a ſmall Diſcourſe againſt it, that it is wholly needleſs for me, or any one elſe, to write further on that Argument. All I intend, is with Fidelity to relate what I have upon diligent ſearch been able to Collect touching the Author and Work which I Publiſh, and I hope I have ſaid what may

prevail

prevail with all Impartial Judges, to admit our Author for a competent Witness of the belief of the Church in his Age, touching Christs Presence in the Holy Sacrament.

An

THE CONTENTS.

Chap. I. AN Historical Account of the Author and his Writings.

Chap. II. Of his Treatise concerning Christ's Body and Blood, and the Author cleared of Heresie, and the other Accusations of F. Cellot.

Chap. III. That this Book is neither wholly forged, nor yet depraved, that Ratramnus is its true Author, and not Joannes Scotus Erigena.

Chap. IV. Of the true sense of the Author in some controverted Expressions.

Chap. V. That this Treatise expresly confutes the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, and is very agreeable to the Doctrin of the Church of England.

Chap. VI.

THE CONTENTS.

Chap. I. *AN Hiſtorical Account of the Author and his Writings.*

Chap. II. *Of his Treatiſe concerning Chriſt's Body and Blood, and the Author cleared of Hereſie, and the other Accuſations of* F. Cellot.

Chap. III. *That this Book is neither wholly forged, nor yet depraved, that* Ratramnus *is its true Author, and not* Joannes Scotus Erigena.

Chap. IV. *Of the true ſenſe of the Author in ſome controverted Expreſſions.*

Chap. V. *That this Treatiſe expreſly confutes the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, and is very agreeable to the Doctrin of the Church of* England.

Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. *That* Ratramnus *was not ſingular in his Opinion, but had ſeveral other great Men in his own and the following Age of the ſame Judgment with him in this Point.*

CHAP.

11 JU 62

CHAP. I.

Of the Author's Name, Countrey and Profeſſion; of his Eminent Learning: With an account of his Works.

IN regard the Author of this Treatiſe hath firſt appeared in Print under the miſtaken Name of *Bertram*, and by that Name is beſt known even to this day, I conceive it may not be amiſs, to ſee what he is called in the Titles of his own Works, and in the Writings of other Authors, eſpecially thoſe of his own Time.

(*a*) *Servatus Lupus* writes to him by the Name of *Rotrannus*, whom (*b*) *Baluzius* doubts not to have been our Author, and it may be probably collected from the ſubject of that Epiſtle. Others call him *Ratramus*, ſo his Name appears to have

(*a*) *Serv. Lupus, Ep.* 79. (*b*) *Baluz. in notis ad Lupum.* Ad Rotrannum Monachum] Corbeienſem.

been written by *Sigebertus Gemblacenſis*, from the two Manuſcripts mentioned by (*c*) *Suffridus Petrus* in his Notes upon him. (*d*) *Flodoardus*, who flouriſhed about an 100 years after our Author, calleth him *Ratrannus*, but in the Inſcriptions of his other Works, ſome of which I have ſeen in Manuſcript, as alſo that of this Tract, (*e*) found by *F. Mabillon* in the Abby of *Lobez*, he is called *Ratramnus*, ſo in the (*f*) Catalogue of that Library taken *A. D.* 1049. as alſo by (*g*) *Hincmarus* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, and (*h*) *Gotteſchalcus*, both contemporary with him, and by the Anonymous Writer publiſhed by (*i*) *F. Cellot*, who is now diſcovered to be (*k*) *Herigerus* Abbot of *Lobez*, who flouriſhed in the end of the

(*c*) *Ad cap.* 96. *Sigeberti, inter Illuſtr. Eccl. Scriptores ed.* 88. *Colon.* 1580. (*d*) *Flodoardi Hiſt. Remenſ. l.* 3. *c.* 15. *&* 28. (*e*) *Mabillon Præfat. ad. Acta Bened. ſecul.* 4. *p.* 2. *cap.* 1. *n.* 43.

(*f*) *Ibidem, ſcribitur* RATRaNI *ſuper poſita communi nota literæ* M *vel* N *unde orta videtur lectio Ratranni.* (*g*) *Hincmarus de Prædſt. c.* 5. *& de non trina Deitate.* (*h*) *In Epiſtola Metrica edita per Cellotium. Append. Opuſc. II. Amico ſervans Ratramno.* (*i*) *Hiſt. Gotteſchalci Prædeſt.* (*k*) *Mabillon Præf. ad Acta Ben. ſecul.* 4. *p.* 2. *c.* 1. *n.* 47, 48, 49. *ex MS. Gemblac.*

Tenth

Tenth Century, and died in the Year, 1007.

His true Name was doubtleſs *Ratrammus*, which came afterwards to be changed into *Bertramus* by the error of ſome Tranſcriber of *Sigebertus*, who miſtook, as he eaſily might, the (*a*) *R* in his Copy for a *B*, the letters being not much unlike, and *Trithemius*, uſing a Copy of *Sigebert* ſo written, hath propagated the miſtake, which though of no great moment, yet ought to be rectify'd, and our Author be called by his true Name.

Ratramnus was in all probability a *Frenchman*, and of the Province of *Picardie*, wherein he became a Monk. He was Educated in the Monaſtery of *Corbey*, not *New Corbey* upon the *Weſer* in *Saxony*, but the *Old Corbey*, in the Dioceſe of *Amiens*, Founded by *Batildis*, Wife to *Clodovæus* the Second King of *France*, in the Year 665. This was a very Eminent Monaſtery

(*a*) The like miſtake hath ſometimes happen'd in other Names, as *Babanus* for *Rabanus*, in two MSS. of *Cellots* Anonymous Writer in the Library of St *Victor* in *Paris*, when in the preceding Page they call *Rabanus*; Differt. *ſur Jean Scot*, Art. 2. p. 6. at the end Mr. *Arnaud's* Defence, in *quarto*, 1669.

of *Benedictins*, in which the (*b*) Discipline of that Order was strictly kept up, in the Ninth Century, when the Monks elsewhere grew very remiss, and it was (*c*) a famous Academy, or Seminary of Learned, as well as Religious Men.

In this Cloyster our Author was so happy a Proficient in the Study of Divinity, that he was esteem'd well qualified for the Holy Order of Priesthood, and accordingly received it. And after the Death of *Bavo*, the same *Ratramnus*, as it is thought, was by *Carolus Calvus* promoted to the Government of the Monastery of (*d*) *Orbais*, in the Diocese of *Soissons*.

Modern Writers, of both the Roman and Reformed Church, have been guilty of mistakes, touching the time wherein *Bertram* wrote this Book. Some place him in the

(*b*) *Quia in Corbeia Monasterio laudabilis eo tempore Religio Monachorum habebatur. Act. Bened. sec. 4. p. 1. In translat. Viti, c. 5.* (*c*) *Mabillonius Corbeiam vocat* Celebrem Academiam *in Act. Ben. sec. 4. p. 2. In Elogio Historico Joanis Æthelingiensis, c. 5.* (*d*) *Flodoard. Hist. Rhem. l. 3. c. 28.* ABP. *Usher* seems to doubt whether he were the same with our Author *Hist. Gotesc. cap. 11. sub finem in margine.* But Bishop *Cosins* Dr. *Cave*, and *Albertinus* doubt not but he was.

very

very beginning of the IX. Century, and ſuppoſe this Tract to be written *A. D.* 800. or 806. or 810. So (*a*) *Poſſevine* and others. The manifeſt cauſe of their miſtake, is the Inſcription [To *Charles* the Great Emperour] which they take for the Author's Addreſs to that Prince, and therefore conclude this Tract muſt needs be written before the Year (*b*) 814. in which he died. But that (*c*) Inſcription is not found in the *MS.* which *F. Mabillon* met with in the Abbey of *Lobez*; nor can it be the Author's. For though *Carolus Calvus* may by ſome Flatterers be ſtiled the *Great*, yet the addition of *Emperour*, will by no means permit us to believe it Genuine, for he was not Emperour till the Year 875. which was above 20 years after *Ratramnus* wrote this Book. So that what hath paſſed for the Inſcription of the Book, is only the conceit of ſome late Tranſcriber.

But as in the firſt Volume of his

(*a*) *Appar. Sac. T.* 1. *Betramus, Garetius circa Annum* 806. Sir *H. Linde* in his Preface to *Bertram.* (*b*) *Lambecius in Orig. Hamb. tom.* 2. *in tab. Chronolog.* (*c*) *Act. Ben. ſec* 4. *p.*2. *Præf. n.* 1. *n.*129.

Apparatus, (*d*) *Poſſevine* fixes our Author in the very beginning of the IX. Century, ſo forgetting himſelf in the ſecond Volume, he errs as much on the other hand, and giving an account of the Works of *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, thruſts *Bertram* down into the latter end of that Age, and makes him to have written *A. D.* 886. under *Carolus Craſſus*, and ſaith, that *Paſchaſius* confuted his error in a Book to *Placidus*. I preſume the ground to this conceit was, that by this means, all objections againſt the Addreſs to *Charles the Great Emperor*, ſeem to be ſolved, in regard of that Prince, his Surname *Craſſus* or *Groſſus*, which is in ſome ſence *Magnus*, and he was at that time Emperor. But this is a meer fetch, which will not paſs now as it might have done 80 or 100 years ſince, the Author and his time being now much better known.

No doubt but as *Lucas Dacherius* tells us (*e*) he lived in great reputation for Learning in the Reign of

(d) *Poſſevin. Apar. ſac. t. 2. Paſchaſius.*

(e) *Literis & fama floruiſſe Ratramnum Ludovici Pii & Caroli Calvi temporibus fidem faciunt quas protulit elucubrationes. Dacherius ſpic. t. 1. Lectori nu. 5*

Ludovis

Ludovicus Pius, and *Charles* his Son, as may be eaſily gathered from the Books written by him on ſeveral occaſions. His two Books of Predeſtination were written, as the Preſident (*f*) *Maugnin* conjectures, *A. D.* 850. which was the next year after *Goteſchalcus* was degraded and condemned in a *Synod* at *Cariſiac*. And his Anſwer to the Objections of the *Greeks*, could not be well written before the Year 868. in regard the *Gallican* Prelates were engaged in the work not above two months before the Death of Pope *Nicolaus* the Firſt, which happened in *December*, 867. So that preſuming *Ratramnus* to have lived 60 years, his flouriſhing Time was from 840. to 870.] (*g*) *Hincmarus* in a Work publiſhed by him in the Year 870. mentions one *Ratramnus Presbyter*, then 90 years of Age, but I am apt to believe he was not our Author, for firſt he ſeems to have been a Secular Prieſt. And again, it is very unlikely ſo

(*f*) *Mauguin. tom.* 2. *Diſſer. Hiſt. cap.* 17.
(*g*) *Hincm. Rhem. Op. tom.* 2. *Opuſc. LV. Capitul. cap.* 1. *tradito Hincmaro Laudun. in Synodo Attiniaci habita, A. D.* 870.

Learned a Man ſhould not ſet up for a Writer till about 60 or 70 years of age, or that he ſhould write ſo ſmartly as he doth againſt the Greek Emperors at 88.

That he was in great Eſteem for Learning in his own Age, is paſt doubt. It is an argument of his known Abilities, that *Charles* the *bald* choſe to conſult him upon points of ſo great moment, as the Predeſtination Controverſie, and that of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament, which appears by the Prefaces and Concluſions of his Work on both thoſe Subjects. And though (*a*) *Feugueræus* in his Preface to *Bertram*, tells us, *that* Carolus Calvus *had no Learned Men in his Court*, as his Grandfather had, *Alcuin*, *Claudius Clemens*, and *Joannes Scotus*, its plain, that herein he is very much miſtaken, as indeed he is almoſt in every thing he ſaith in that Preface. For *Carolus Calvus* was a great Patron of Learning and Learned Men: *Joannes Scotus* lived in his Court, and not in the

(*a*) *Feuguer. Opuſc. Lugd. Præfat. p.* 9, 10. *Quod altem ad* Calvi *Aulam attinet*, nullo *quod ſciam* docto uno *ornata memoratur.*

Court

Court of *Charles* the *Great*, and I verily believe that through the Ignorance of ſome Monk, who had read the Names of thoſe Learned Men who were in favour with *Charles the Great*, thus recited, *Alcuinum Flaccum, Claudium Scotum*, or *Claudium Clementem Scotum*, &c. and miſtook *Scotum*, whereby the Country of *Claudius Clemens*, who was an Iriſhman, is deſigned for the Name of a Man; *Joannes Scotus Erigena* hath been made a Domeſtick of *Charles the Great*, and thoſe other ſenſeleſs Stories, that he was a Scholar of (*b*) *V. Bede*, Companion of *Alcuin*, and an Aſſiſtant to him in Founding the Univerſity of *Paris*, have been raiſed. For *Scotus* is ordinarily mentioned next after this *Claudius* on this occaſion. But the miſtake ſeems ancient, as *Berengarius* by a *MS.* Epiſtle of his to *Richardus*, * publiſhed by *D'Achery*, and from him by *Labbe* in the Councils. Beſides *Scotus*,

(*b*) *Vinc. Bellovac. Spec. Hiſt. l.* 23. *c.* 173. *apud Nat. Alex. de Jo. Scoto Erig. ſec.* 9. *p.* 2. *diſſ.* 14. *Fuerunique Pariſiis fundatores illius ſtudii quatuor Monachi Bedæ diſcipuli. Rabanus & Alcuinus, Claudius & Joannes Scotus.*

* *Dacherii Spicil. t.* 2. *Concil. t.* 9 *col.* 1062.

that

that King favoured other Learned Men, who have written upon ſeveral Arguments by his Command. In the matter of Predeſtination, he held two ſeveral Councils in his own Palace at *Cariſiac*, in the firſt of which *Goteſchalcus* was Condemned, and in the ſecond the Doctrine of the Catholick Church was ſtated in four ſhort Determinations, though not in all points according to the Sentiments of ſome of the moſt Learned Men in *France*. He conſulted *Scotus*, (*a*) *Servatus Lupus*, and our Author. And (*b*) *Goteſchalcus*, about whom all this Controverſie aroſe in an Epiſtle to *Ratrammus*, ſaith, that there were many Learned Men then about his Court. And no queſtion but he always conſulted Men of eminent note. *Ratrammus* was alſo in good eſteem with *Odo*, Succeſſor to *Paſchaſius* in the Abbey of *Corbey*, and afterwards Biſhop of *Beauvais*, to whom he dedicates his Book *de Anima*, and who in all probability nominated him as a fit Perſon

(*a*) *Vide Serv. Lupi*, Ep. 128.

(*b*) *Deniq; ſunt multi, Domino donante, Magiſtri*
Hæc regione ſiti, ingenio lucupleve periti,
Unde Palatina pleriq; morantur in Aula.
Vide Append. Celloiii, Opuſc. II.

to

to Anſwer the Objections of the *Greeks* againſt the *Latin* Church. Nay, *F. Cellot* acknowledgeth, *That* Hincmarus *himſelf had ſuch an eſteem of him, [long after his writing of the Sacrament and Predeſtination,] That when at the deſire of Pope* Nicolaus I. *he ſought all* France *for Learned Men to write againſt the* Greeks, *he invited* Ratramnus *by Name to undertake that ſervice.* Nor had *Hincmarus*, *Odo*, and the other *Gallican* Prelates, a better opinion of his Abilities for that Work, than (a) *F. Mabillon* hath of his Performance, who ſaith, *That whoever ſhall compare the work of* Ratramnus *with that of* Æneas Pariſienſis, *will eaſily diſcern how much* Ratramnus *excelled him in Learning and Eloquence, for whereas* Æneas *ordinarily produces naked and jejune Teſtimonies, without any conſiderable Remarks upon them,* Ratramnus *alledges many more, and better Authorities, inforcing and illuſtrating them by ſolid reaſonings of his own.* The ſame good opinion hath Preſident

Cellot. Hiſt. Gottef. l. 3. c. 7. ſect. 2.

(a) *Præfat. ad Act. Ben. ſecul. 4. p. 2. n.* 161. Ratramnus *vero longe plura & potiora prolatis ex proprio genio validis ratiociniis quæ argumentis & autoritatibus à ſe adductis lucem ac robur concilient.*

Mauguin

Mauguin of his Performance in his two Books of Predeſtination, when he calls him, (*a*) *Non levis armaturæ in Eccleſia Chriſti militem, No raw Soldier lightly armed, but an undaunted Champion of the Catholick Truth, againſt Innovators.* And much more he adds in his Praiſe. And though in his writing about the Sacrament, (*b*) Mr. *Arnauld* is pleaſed to ſtyle him, *A fantaſtical, obſcure and empty Divine, whoſe reaſonings are frothy cavils*, yet in the Controverſies of Predeſtination, and Grace, both he and his Brethren the Janſeniſts acknowledge his Abilities his great Reputation for Learning in *France*, and ſtyle him, *That Learned Benedictine*, &c. I might add, that *Servatus Lupus* treats him in his Addreſs, as (*c*) an intimate and much eſteemed Friend, directing his Epiſtle, *To his moſt dear Rotrannus*; and (*d*) *Baluzius* numbers him among the

(*a*) *Mauguin. tom.* 2. *in Diſſert Hiſt. c.* 17.
(*b*) *Refut. du Mr.* Claude, *p.* 3. *c.* 5.
(*c*) *Clariſſimo ſuo R. Lupus, Ep.* 79. (*d*) *Familiares habuit Præſtantiſſimos quoſque ſui ſeculi viros, Hincmarum Rem. Rhabanum Mog. Wenilonem Senon: Heriboldum [illegible] Ratbertum Corbeienſem, Ratramnum Monachum Corbienſem, &c. Baluz. in notis at titulum* [Beati Lupi] *p.* 340.

Famous

Famous Men who were the familiar Acquaintance of that Learned Abbot. As alſo the Teſtimony of the *Chronicon Hirſaugienſe*, publiſhed by *Trithemius*, *That he was a Perſon well accompliſhed with all ſorts of Literature*, and many other proofs of his admirable Learning: But I conceive thoſe already produced, will convince all unprejudiced Perſons; and ſince his other Works have appeared in Print, the Adverſaries of his Doctrine, touching the Real Preſence, are aſhamed to deny him right in this point, and betake themſelves to other arts for the evading the force of his Teſtimony of the Belief of the Church in that Age.

To cloſe this Section, I ſhall give a brief account of his Writings, as well thoſe which are not extant, as thoſe we have in Print.

The firſt of his Writings extant, is that of the manner of *Chriſt's Birth*, or of the *Virgins Delivery*. This muſt have been written before the Year 844. (*a*) in which *Paſcaſius Radbertus* was made Abbot of *Corbey*,

(*a*) *Sirmondus in Vita Paſchaſii Radberti operibus præfixa. Par.* 1618.

if

if (b) *F. Mabillon* miſtake not when he tells us, that his two Books on that Argument, are a Confutation of *Ratramne*. For he doth not ſtyle himſelf *Abbot*, but only the *off-ſcouring of all Monks*, whereas in his (c) Epiſtle to *Carolus Culvus*, publiſhed by *F. Mabillon*, he ſtyles himſelf *Abbot*. Nor could his Book be written after his Reſignation of that Abbey, being dedicated to *Theodrada*, Abbeſs of *Soiſſons*, and her Nuns, which (d) *Theodrada* died, *A. D.* 846. and he reſigned not till 851.

The occaſion of his writing, was News out of *Germany*, (as I gueſs from *New Corbey*, which had much correſpondence with this *Corbey* in *France*, of which it was a Colony,) that ſome in thoſe Parts held ſtrange opinions, touching our Saviour's Birth; *as though he came not out of his Mothers Womb, into the World, the ſame way with other Men.* In oppoſi-

(b) *Mabillon in Præf. ad Acta Ben. ſec.* 4. *p.* 2. *c.* 3. *nu.* 150.
Monachorum omnium peripſema.

(c) *Ibidem inter Acta Ben. p.* 135. — *Humilis & exiguus Radbertus veſter, etſi indignus, Abbas & Levita Chriſti* Monachorum omnium peripſema. (d) *Mabil. ubi ſupra.*

tion

tion to that Doctrine, (*a*) *Ratramnus* asserts, *That Christ was Born as other Men, and his Virgin Mother bare him, as other Women bring forth*, to use (*b*) *Tertullian*'s words, *patefacti corporis lege*. Those whose opinions he confutes, were perhaps, some of those Novices, for whose use *Paschasius* had written his Book of the Sacrament, and who had not only imbibed his Doctrine, touching the Carnal Presence of Christ therein, but might have also heard the manner of our Saviour's Birth, without opening his Mother's Womb, alledged to solve an Objection against it, for our Adversaries of the Church of *Rome* now say, (*c*) that it is no more impossible for one Body to be in two places than for two Bodies to be in one, which they conceive must have happened in our Saviours Birth, as also in his Resurrection, and coming into his Disciples, the Door being shut. This might provoke *Paschasius* to write against our Author, as well as Zeal for the Blessed Virgins Integrity.

(*a*) *Vide Librum Ratramni apud Dacherium Spicil. Tom.* 1. (*b*) *Tertul. de Carne Christi, c.*23. (*c*) *Vide Guil. Forbesii Consider. Modest. de Sacr. Euchar. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

And

And having ſaid thus much on this ſubject, I cannot wave ſo fair an opportunity of doing right to the ever memorable Archbiſhop *Uſher*, whom *Lucas Dacherius* having publiſhed this Work, reproacheth as a Lyar, for ſaying, (*a*) *That* Ratramnus *in this Work maintaineth the ſame Doctrine, which he hath delivered in his Book touching the Lord's Body and Blood*, whereas he makes no mention of the *Euchariſt* in it. And *F. Mabillon*, who for his Candor is no leſs to be honoured than for his great Learning, imputes it to prejudice or miſtake.

But I need not uſe (*c*) *Conringius* his ſhift to vindicate him, and ſuppoſe *Dacherius* hath ſuppreſſed thoſe paſſages which induced the Learned Primate to ſay what he did. It is enough to juſtifie him, that (*d*) *Ratramnus* aſſerts two things, which by conſequence oppoſe Tranſubſtantiation, and eſtabliſh the contrary Do-

(*a*) *Uſſerius in Hiſt. Gotteſc. c.* 11. (*b*) *Mabillon. Act. Ben. Præf. ſec.* 4. *p.* 2. *c.* 3. *nu.* 153.
(*c*) *Conringius ad Antiquit. Accad. Supplemento* 39. *apud Mabillon. ibid.*
(*d*) *Apud Dacherium Spicil. Tom.* 1. *p.* 333.

ctrine,

ctrine; and this he notoriouſly doth, 1. *In the very ſcope and drift of his Book*, contradicting an Illuſtration of that Doctrine by the manner of Chriſt's Birth. 2. *By Denying that Chriſt (though Omnipreſent in his Divinity) can in his Body be in more than one place, ſo that when he comes to a new place, he leaves the place where he was before.* This Opinion in its conſequences, maintains the Doctrine of his Book concerning Chriſt's Body, though not expreſly in Terms.

And this is as much as the Primate ſaith. And when we conſider where the Diſpute concerning Chriſt's Birth began, and that *Paſchaſius* defended it, what I have ſaid will appear not improbable. This Book is alſo in Manuſcript in *Salisbury* Library, and that of *Bennet* College in *Cambridge*.

On what occaſion he wrote his two Books of Predeſtination, I have already related. They are publiſhed by *Mauguin*, and in the new *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Printed at *Lyons*, 1677. *Tom.* XV. *p.* 442.

He likewiſe wrote a Book, about the Year 853. to juſtifie an old Hymn

which (a) *Hincmarus* of *Rhemes* had commanded to be altered, and that inſtead of *Te Trina Deitas*, they ſhould ſing *Te Summa Deitas*, imagining the former expreſſion to make Three Gods, againſt which Order of *Hincmarus*, *Ratramnus* wrote a large Book, aſſerting the expreſſion to be Orthodox by the Authority of St. *Hilary* and St. *Auguſtine*, but this piece is loſt.

He wrote another Book (b) *de Anima*, at the inſtance of *Odo*, ſometimes Abbot of *Corbey*, and Biſhop of *Beauvais* againſt a Monk of the ſame Convent, who taught that all Men had but one and the ſame Soul, which Book is extant in Manuſcript in the (c) Library of *Bennet* College in

(a) *Teſte ipſo Hincmaro in libro* De non Trina Deitate, *operum T.* 1. 450.

Et Mauguin. Diſſert. Hiſt. c. 17. *Debinc poſt aliquot annos cum Hincmarus in Eccleſia Remenſi vetuſtiſſimum & receptiſſimum Hymni Eccleſiaſtici hunc verſiculum* Te Trina Deitas unaque poſcimus, *cantari vetuiſſet Ipſe Ratramnus volumine non modicæ quantitatis ad Hildegarium Meldenſem Epiſcopum edito ex libris SS. Hilarii & Auguſtini de Trinitate veterem Eccleſiæ Traditionem confirmavit.*

(b) *Teſte Mabilioni ubi ſupr. n.* 156. & (c) Uſſerio. *Hiſt. Gotteſch. c.* 2.

Cam-

Cambrige, in that of *Salisbury* Church, and of St. *Eligius* at *Noyon* in *France*, but not Printed.

About the Year 868. Pope (*a*) *Nicolaus* I. having desired *Hincmarus*, and the *French* Bishops, to Consider and Answer the Objections of the *Greeks* against the *Latine* Church; and *Hincmarus* having employed *Odo* Bishop of *Beauvais* therein, it is likely he recommended our Author to the Bishops, as a Man fit to underrake such a Work, and accordingly he wrote four Books on that Occasion, published by (*b*) *Dacherius*.

He hath also among the (*c*) *MSS.* of *Leipsick* Library, an Epistle concerning the *Cynocephali*, Whether they be truly Men and of *Adam*'s Seed, or Bruit Creatures? What moved him to discuss this Question, or how he hath determined it, I know not. The Epistle is directed to one *Rimbert* a Presbyter (I am

(*a*) *Vide Mauguin. T.* 2. *Dissert. c.* 17. *Titulus libri sic se habet. Contra opposita Græcorum Imperatorum Romanam Ecclesiam infamantium libri quatuor Ratbramni Monachi. Teste Mabillonio.* (*b*) *Spicileg. T.* 2.

(*c*) *Vide Felleri Catal. Codd. MSS. Biblioth. Paulinæ in Acad. Lipsiensi Duod.* 1686. *p.* 125.

apt to think) the ſame who ſucceeded *Anſcharius* in the See of *Breme*, and wrote his Life. For he was born not far from *Old Corbey*, and bred up by St. *Anſcharius*, and therefore more likely to correſpond with *Ratramn*, than the other *Rimbertus Presbyter*, who was a *Dane*, and employed in the Converſion of the Northern Nations.

If the Epiſtle were addreſſed to the former, it muſt be written in or before the Year 865. when *Rimbert* was made Archbiſhop of *Breme* and *Hambrough*.

I mention this Book of the Lord's Body and Blood, in the laſt place, written by him, as ſome gueſs, about the Year 850. or perhaps ſooner. Of which I ſhall ſay no more at preſent, in regard it will furniſh matter ſufficient for ſeveral Chapters.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of his Treatiſe concerning Chriſt's Body and Blood, and the Author cleared of Hereſie, and the other Accuſations of F. Cellot.

THis Treatiſe of the Body and Blood of the Lord, was firſt Printed at *Colon*, *A. D.* 1532. (*a*) who was the Publiſher, or what Copy he followed, or what became of the Manuſcript afterwards, I know not. The Name of *Bertram*, and the Inſcription to *Charles the Great*, are an unqueſtionable proof that it was not the *Lobes MS.* but ſome other not ſo ancient, which it is probable fell into bad hands, and is made away.

(*a*) *Cellot* ſaith, it was firſt publiſhed from a Copy prepared for the Preſs by *Oecolampadius*, who died before it was Printed: That it was not Printed at *Colen*, but *Baſil*. How truly, I know not.

The appearance of an Author near 700 years old, and ſo expreſly contradicting their Doctrine, put the *Romiſh* Doctors into great confuſion. They all ſaw it was neceſſary to take ſome courſe to deprive the *Proteſtants* of the advantage they were likely to make of ſo material a Witneſs againſt them: But they were very much divided in their Opinions, what courſe would prove moſt effectual.

Some have condemned the Author for an Heretick, which is a quick and ſure way to invalidate his Teſtimony in a point of Faith.

Others have ſpared the Author, but condemned the Book for Spurious as well as Heretical, or at leaſt as corrupted by the Diſciples of *Berengarius* and *Wiclef*.

Others ſay, that it is not the Work of *Ratramne*, Monk of *Corbey*, but of *Joannes Scotus Erigena*.

And laſtly, their moſt Learned Writers of this preſent Age, allow the Book to be *Bertram*'s, and notwithſtanding ſome raſh expreſſions in it, which may bear a Catholick ſenſe, acknowledge the Work as well as its Author to be Orthodox, and ſay, he doth not oppoſe the preſent Doctrin of

of the *Roman* Church, being rather for Tranſubſtantiation, than againſt it.

Wherefore to vindicate this Work from our Adverſaries, who uſe ſo many tricks to wreſt it out of our hands, I ſhall endeavour theſe five things.

1. To ſhew that *Ratramnus* was Orthodox, and free from all juſt imputation of Hereſie.

2. To prove that this Treatiſe is a genuine piece of the IX. Century, that it hath not been maliciouſly depraved ſince thoſe times, and that *Ratramnus*, and not *Joannes Scotus Erigena*, is the Author thereof.

3. To ſettle the true ſence of our Author, in ſome obſcure and controverted terms.

4. To prove, that the Doctre in delivered in this Book, is contrary to that of *Paſchaſius*, and the preſent *Roman* Church, but very agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

5. To ſhew that he was not ſingular in his Doctrine, but that other Great Men of that and the next Age, were of the ſame Judgment with him.

First then, let us consider the charge of Heresie, which some object against him. *Turrian* saith, *That to cite* Bertram, *is only to shew that* Calvin's *Heresie is not new. Bellarmine* vouchsafes him no place in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, tho' twice he mentions him on the by, and fixes him, *A. D.* 850. But in his (*a*) Controversies he numbers him among his Hereticks; and with *Possevine* (who saith notwithstanding the *Belgick* Index, this Book may not be read but with the Pope's License, in order to confute it) makes him to have lived under *Carolus Crassus*, *A. D.* 886. So little exactness do these Great Men observe in their Writings, as to Chronology, so little do they mind what they themselves elsewhere say, that an ill-natur'd *Protestant* Critick might insult over *Possevine* and *Bellarmine*, for slips in Chronology, as often and as justly as (*b*) *Phil. Labbe* doth over *Gerhard*, *Hottinger*, *Maresius*, &c.

(*a*) *Bell. Controv. Tom.* 3. *de Sacr. Eucharist. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *sec. Tertius.*

(*b*) Phil. Labbe de Script. Eccles. *quos possim Onochronos, Ardeliones, Mataeologos, appellat.*

But

But (a) *F. Mabillon* obſerves other Writers every whit as Learned and Orthodox, abſolve him from the charge of Hereſie, and he blames thoſe Zealots for giving away an Author to the Hereticks, whom their Anceſtors always eſteemed a Catholick. (b) *Phil. Labbe* numbers him among the Catholick Tractators, *Radbert*, *Lanfranc*, and *Guitmund*. And the Authors of the *Belgick* Index ſay he was a *Catholick Prieſt*.

And to condemn him upon the Teſtimony of ſo incompetent Witneſſes, as *Turrian*, *Bellarmine*, *Poſſevine*, &c. who are notoriouſly Parties, and lived many hundred years after him, is againſt all Reaſon and Equity. Eſpecially when they charge him with no Heretical Opinions ſave in the matter of the Sacrament, for which he was never condemned in his own Age, and which is the point now in Controverſie between us and them.

That our Author had the honour to be conſulted by *Carolus Calvus*, on very profound Arguments, his fami-

(a) *Præfat. ad Act. Ben. ſec.* 14. *p.* 2. *c.* 1. *n.* 125.
(b) *De Script. Eccleſ. T.* 1. *p.* 53.

liarity

larity with *Lupus* Abbot of *Ferriers*, (*a*) *Odo* Biſhop of *Beauvais*, and *Hildegarius* Biſhop of *Meaux*; the truſt repoſed in him by the *French* Prelates, who employed him to write an Apology for the *Latin* Church againſt the *Greeks*; to which I may add (if he were the ſame Perſon whom *Flodoardus* mentions as Abbot of *Orbais*) his Preferment to that Dignity, are ſomewhat more than ſtrong preſumptions that he had the repute of an Orthodox, as well as a Learned Man.

I know no body that offers to make good this charge in particular inſtances, but *F. Cellot* (*b*) a Jeſuite, whoſe accuſations are home, I confeſs, and repreſent him as Heterodox, though not convict of Hereſie, but he ſeldom offers in proof any thing, ſave ſome bold conjectures, and thoſe often contrary to the ſentiments of the moſt Learned Writers of his own Church.

1. He makes him Heterodox in the

(*a*) *Ex Titulo* MS. *operis de Anima.*

(*b*) *Lud. Cellot. Hiſt. Gotteſc. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *in quæſtione de Euchariſtia monſtrabitur Hæreticus, &c.*

matter

matter of (*a*) Predeſtination, and to have been the Tutor of *Gotteſchalcus*, which I conceive is not ſufficiently proved from the Complements of that Monk, who writes to him, as he had done to *Lupus* and others, and calls him *Friend and Maſter*. That he favoured the ſentiments of *Gotteſchalcus*, I deny not, and that he wrote againſt *Hincmarus*, but that he was not ſo rigid in the point as that poor Monk *F. Cellot* himſelf confeſſeth. *Lupus* was of the ſame judgment, ſo was *Prudentius* Biſhop of *Troyes*, and (*b*) *Remigius* Archbiſhop of *Lyons*, who ſticks not to cenſure the puniſhment of *Gotteſchalcus* as beyond all examples of cruelty, and as unmerciful uſage unbecoming Religious Men, and the proceedings againſt him at *Cariſiac* as irregular. Our Author's judgment ſeems to be no other than St. *Auguſtine*'s againſt the *Pelagians*, and after all *F. Cellot*'s accuſations, theſe Books are newly Printed in the laſt Edition

(*a*) *Cellot. Hiſt. Gotteſc. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *numerat inter cauſas naufragii miſerabilis Monachi*, Ratramni Magiſterium, *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *In Prædeſtinatione ita ſe Catholicum exibet ut tamen non levem ſuſpicionem ſiniſtræ doctrinæ —— relinquat.*

(*b*) *Vide Uſſer. Hiſt. Gotteſc. c.* 16.

of

of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* at *Lyons*, without the leaſt cenſure.

2. He repreſents him as Heterodox, in the * Doctrine of the Trinity, for oppoſing the Alteration of *Trina Deitas* by *Hincmarus* in an old Hymn, upon pretence that it implied Three God's. But this conteſt was not about any Article of Faith, for (*a*) *Gotteſchalcus* and *Ratramnus* did as little believe Three Gods, as *Hincmarus*, nor doth he accuſe them as *Tritheites*; the Diſpute was about the ſence of *Trina Deitas*, which they denied to import Three Gods, any more than did *Trinus Deus*, and therefore no Alteration need be made in the old uſage of the Church. And in this

---

* *Cellot. Hiſt. Gotteſc. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *in explicatione Trinitatis ex errore diſcipuli, & ipſe errare iutelligetur.*

(*a*) *Trinas Deitates affirmantem ipſe Goteſchalcus execratur, apud Hincmarum de non Trina Deit.*

Hymni Sanctorum mentis *Strophe Vetus in Natali plurium Martyrum.*

Te Trina Deitas unaque poſcimus.
Ut culpas abluas, noxia detrahas,
Des pacem famulis, nos quoque gloriam,
Per cuncta tibi ſæcula.

Con-

Controverſie, he had the (*b*) Religious of his own Order on his ſide, who ſtoutly reſiſted the Alteration. And at laſt, a greater Clerk than *Hincmarus*, I mean (*c*) *Thomas Aquinas*, compoſing an Hymn, now uſed in the *Roman* Church, inſerts this very expreſſion. *But*, ſaith (*d*) *F. Cellot*, *he refers* Trina *to the Perſons, not to the Nature.* And ſo (notwithſtanding his confident denial) did *Ratramnus* and *Gotteſchalcus* too. And upon the whole Controverſie, *Mauguin* and *Natalis Alexander*, allow them to have had the better of *Hincmarus* in this Diſpute.

3. (*e*) *Cellot* accuſeth him for writing a crafty and heretical Tract againſt his Abbot *Paſchaſius Radber-*

(*b*) *Mauguin. Tom. 2. Diſſert. c. 45. Religioſi S. Benedicti diu multumque reluctati ſunt huic immutationi.* (*c*) *Teſte N. Alexandro, ſec. 9. p. 2. Diſſ. V. 7. 14. in Hymno Sacris Solemniis ab Angelico Doctore — edito ubique canit, in Feſto Corp. Chriſti in Nocturn.*

Te Trina Deitas unaque poſcimus,
Sic tu nos viſita ſicut te colimus,
Per tuas ſemitas duc nos quo tendimus,
Ad lucem quam inhabitas.

(*d*) *Hiſt. Gotteſc. l. 5. c. 5.*

(*e*) *Append. ad Hiſt. Gotteſc. Opuſc. 7. in notis paſſim.*

tus,

tut, who had explained the Catholick Doctrine of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament. The Fact I admit, the Crime I deny him guilty of, and ſhall vindicate him in a proper place.

4. He makes him of a buſie and (*b*) pragmatical Humour, a Noveliſt, and Rebel againſt his Superiors, *viz.* his Abbot and his Archbiſhop; but how hard this cenſure is, will appear, when we conſider, that he ſeems not to have engaged in any Controverſie ſave by the Command of his Prince, or ſome Great Prelate, except in his Book *de Nativitate Chriſti*. That his Book of the Sacrament and Predeſtination, in which he diſſents from his Superior, were written by the King's Order, and that in defence of the old Verſe, propably at the requeſt of *Hildegarius* Biſhop of *Meaux*, to whom he dedicated it, and at the requeſt

(*b*) *Vanum vocat & novandi cupidum, —— Ingenium omnium novitatum capix Ratumni, lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 45.

Turbæ errantis Anteſignani Ratramnus & Gotteſchalcus, par Novatorum, p. 346. *Monachum Corb adverſus Metropolitanum & Abbatem ſuum calcitrantem. Hiſt. Got. p.* 570.

of

of the *Benedictins*, who eſteemed him the moſt able Champion of that whole Order, but the Book being loſt, we cannot be poſitive. However, he treats them reſpectfully enough, confuting their Opinions without reflecting on their Perſons, or ſo much as naming them any where, as I remember. Nor can he juſtly be ſtiled a Noveliſt, who only reſiſted the Innovating humour of others, and ſupported his own Doctrine by Teſtimonies out of the Antient Fathers, and publick Offices of the Church.

There appears nothing in all his Writings ſavouring of Pride or Faction, and had he been on the other ſide, I doubt not but *F. Cellot* would as freely have forgiven him his ſentiments touching the Sacrament, as he doth *John Scotus*, who doth him ſervice againſt the *Janſeniſts*.

Though *Ratramnus* ſeems to have committed one fault, which a Jeſuite can hardly forgive, he hath betrayed the Popes Supremacy in his Apology againſt the *Greeks*. He foundeth it not upon any grant from Chriſt.

Chriſt, (a) *but on Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, the Grants of Princes, and the Dignity of the City of* Rome, *the Head and Miſtreſs of all Cities in the Empire, as the Pope hath the Prehemineence over all Biſhops and Churches*, which though at the time when our Author wrote, was as much as the Pope himſelf could wiſh, yet comes ſo ſhort of the Papal claims ſince the *Hildebrandine* times, that he now paſſeth at beſt but for a Trimming Catholick, with *F. Cellot* and his Friends.

(a) Cellotius Hiſt. Gotteſc. Append. p. 578. citat hæc ex Ratramni, l. 4. adverſos Græcos. *Quarta die Imperator Conſtantinus privilegium, Romanæ Eccleſiæ pontifici conſtituit, ut in toto orbe Romano Sacerdotes ita hunc caput habeant, ut Judices Regem. — Quando quidem ſit Romana Civitas omnibus imperii Romani civitatibus honorabilior, & Romanus Pontifex principatum obineat Sacerdotii ſuper omnes Epiſcopos, utpote cum ſit Civitas hæc Domina omnium & illi civitati quiſquis* præfuerit Epiſcopus *ex antiquitatis conſtitutione* [non Chriſti] *princeps omnium habeatur Eccleſiarum* — & paulo poſt. *Quis autem ferat ut Conſtantopolitanus Patriarcha cunctis præferatur Eccleſiis, quod nec Antiquitas ei contulit, nec ulla decreta majorum conſtituunt, nec rationis habetur, vel Eccleſiaſticæ vel humanæ juræ fundatum.*

This

This I hope will ſuffice to vindicate *Ratramnus* both in point of Faith towards God, and of good manners towards his Governors, ſo that there appears nothing in his Perſon, to prejudice us againſt his Doctrine delivered in this Book, which whether it be his or not, and whether it be come pure and undepraved to our hands, I ſhall enquire in the next Chapter.

CHAP. III.

That this Book is neither wholly forged, nor yet depraved; that Ratramnus *is its true Author, and not* Joannes Scotus Eregina.

AMong our Adverſaries of the *Roman* Church, who allow the Author, but condemn his Work, there paſs Three ſeveral Opinions, and all falſe.

1. That it is a * late forgery, that it was written by *Oecolampadius*, and publiſhed under the venerable Name of an Author of the IX Century by the Hereticks. This *Sixtus Senenſis*, and after him *Poſſevine*, with extreme impudence pretend. But for want of good memories, they elſewhere tell us, that the Author of that Book, wrote under *Charles the Great*, *A. D.* 810. or the *Groſſe*, *A. D.* 886.

* *Sixtus Senenſ. in Præfat Biblioth. Sanctæ. Poſſevinus in Præfat. Apar. Sac. Breerly.*

Parſons in his three Controverſ. *p.* 2. *c.* 10. But he makes the forgery committed by the Followers of *Berengarius*.

and

and was confuted by *Paſchaſius Radbertus*. Sure *Sixtus Senenſis* forgot himſelf very much, when in the very next Page he accuſed *Oecolampadius* for rejecting St. *Ambroſe* his Books of the Sacrament, which are cited by *Bertram* in this Work. It is withal pleaſant to obſerve, that Biſhop *Fiſher* (*a*) againſt *Oecolampadius*, names *Bertram* (among other Catholick Writers of the Sacrament) five years before the firſt Edition of it, 1532. and I am apt to believe he had read it in Manuſtript, and was of the ſame mind with the Univerſity of *Doway*, who think with candid expounding he is Catholick enough: But it were doing too much honour to this ſhameleſs calumny, for me to inſiſt longer on its confutation.

2. Others more plauſibly, allow *Bertram* to have written a Book of this Argument, and that this is the Book, but falling into the hands of Hereticks, the diſciples of *Berengarius* and *Wiclef*, it is come down to us wretchedly corrupted and depraved. This is the Opinion

(*a*) *Præf. lib.* 4. *De veritate Corp. & Sang. Chriſti contra Oecolam. Colen.* 1527.

of * *Eſpencæus*, † *Gregory* of *Valentia*, and many others, particularly the Publiſhers of the laſt *Bibliotheca Patrum* at *Lyons*, who give this reaſon why they have not inſerted it into that Collection, *viz.* || *Becauſe it is, if not a ſuſpicious piece, yet depraved and adulterated with ſpurious mixtures.*

This is eaſily ſaid, but not ſo eaſily believ'd: In whoſe hands have the Manuſcripts been kept, in ours or theirs? Hath not the Popiſh Intereſt prevailed all *Europe* over till the beginning of the XVI. Century? Have not the Popiſh Clergy had the keeping all famous Libraries, and have they kept them ſo negligently, that Hereticks have had acceſs and opportunity of depraving all the Copies in the World? If they ſay, their number was ſmall, and it might eaſily be done, whom are we to thank for that? If they are interpolated, why do they not aſſign the paſſages, and by genuine Copies convince the World of ſo groſs an Impoſture? But alas! the

* *Eſpenc. De Ador. Euchar. l.* 4. *c.* 19.

† *Greg. De Valentia in Thom. Tom.* 4. *diſp.* 6. *q.* 3. *punct.* 1.

|| *Bibliothecæ Patrum. Lugd.* 1677. *T. XV. ad finem libri ſecundi de Prædeſt.*

pretence

pretence of Interpolation is very idle, and he that would go about to clear it of what they call Hereſie, muſt do it *una litura*, and with a ſingle daſh expunge the whole Book; for though they may pick out two or three paſſages that ſeem to favour them, yet if they read the next ſentences before and after, they will plainly ſee they are nothing to their purpoſe.

For my own part, I doubt not, but that this Book is come to our hands as free from corruption as any Book of ſo great Antiquity, it is manifeſtly all of one piece; but if it be corrupted, thoſe of the Church of *Rome* are likely to have been the Interpolators, it being more eaſie to foiſt in two or three paſſages into a Book, than two hundred; and I can, beyond all poſſibility of contradiction, make out, that thoſe paſſages which we alledge in favour of our Doctrine againſt Tranſubſtantiation, are near an hundred years older than *Berengarius*, who was for almoſt thirty years together baited in one Council after another, and died about the Year 1088. For *Ælfrick*, Abbot of *Malmsbury*, in a Homily tranſlated by him into into the *Saxon* tongue about the year 970.

hath taken word for word moſt of thoſe paſſages which now ſound harſh to *Roman* Ears: This was obſerved by the Learned (*a*) *Uſher*, who hath collected ſeveral, and I having with care compared *Bertram* and that Homily, have obſerved ſeveral others, and I conceive it will not not be unacceptable to the Reader to ſee them ſet in parallel, which I ſhall do, following the (*b*) Edition Printed by *John Day* in 12° about the year 1566. And it is remarkable, that after the Homiliſt comes to treat of the Sacrament (for a good part of their diſcourſe is about the Paſchal Lamb) there ſcapes hardly one Page without ſomewhat out of *Bertram* till he reſume his former diſcourſe.

(*a*) Anſwer to the Jeſuits Challenge, *ch.* 3 of the Real Preſence.

(*b*) This Homily is extant in the ſecond Tome of the Book of Martyrs. And in *Liſle*'s *Saxon Monuments*, in *quarto*, *Lond.* 1638. In *Engliſh* alone at *Oxford*, about the Year 1674. And in *Saxon* and *Latin* by Mr. *Wheelock* in his Notes on *Bede*, *Hiſt. Eccl. L. V. c.* 22. *p.* 462.

THE

I ſhall only note by the way, that the old word † *Houſel*, which is frequently uſed in this Homily, to ſignifie the Holy Euchariſt, is of *Gothick* Extraction, and derived from Hunsl, a *Sacrifice*, in *Saxon* Huſel, the letter N. being here, as in ſome other Inſtances, left out to ſoften the Pronunciation. Our *Saxon* Anceſtors ſtiled the Holy Euchariſt a *Sacrifice*, as the Fathers, both *Greek* and *Latin* antiently did in a *large and improper Senſe*, viz. Either as it is a Commemoration of that proper Sacrifice once offered on the Croſs, or as Alms, Prayers, and Thankſgiving are ſometimes called a Sacrifice.

---

† Huſel *ab Hoſtia derivari modeſte conjicit Eruditiſſimus Somnerus; at rectius omnino Cl. Junius in Gloſſario a Gothico* HUNSL *deducit Saxonicum* Huſel, *litera N, euphoniæ gratia, uti in nonnullis aliis origine Gothicis e media Sublata, ex. gr.* Tunth *Gothice, Saxonice* Toð *Anglice* Tooth, Munth *Gothice, Saxonice* Muð, *Anglice*, Mouth, *&c.*

Ratramnus,

As *Bertram* defines what a *Figure* is, and what the *Truth*. § 6, 7, 8.

§ 8. *Veritas——utpote cum Chriſtus dicitur natus de Virgine, Paſſus, Crucifixus, mortuus & ſepultus.* One of his Inſtances of a Figure is, when Chriſt calleth himſelf Bread, whereas *ſubſtantialiter nec Panis Chriſtus, &c.*

§ 9. *At ille panis qui per Sacerdotis miniſterium Chriſti corpus efficitur aliud exterius humanis ſenſibus* oſtendit, *aliud interius Fidelium mentibus* clamat. *Exterius quidem panis quod ante fuerat, forma prætenditur, color oſtenditur, ſapor accipitur——*

§ 10. *Cum tamen poſt Myſticam conſecrationem, nec panis jam dicitur nec vinum, ſed Chriſti corpus & ſanguis.*

§ 17. *Conſideremus fontem Sacri Baptiſmatis, qui fons vitæ non immerito nuncupatur——in eo tamen fonte ſi conſideretur*

The *Saxon* Homily.

SO *Ælfric* ſaith, ſome things are ſpoken of Chriſt by ſignification, *i. e.* figuratively, and ſome in propriety. p. 31.

A true thing and certain it is, that Chriſt was born of a Maid, ſuffered death of his own accord. He is called Bread by ſignification, *i. e.* figuratively, but Chriſt is not ſo in true nature, neither Bread, &c.

p. 32. Truly the Bread and Wine, which through the Maſs of the Prieſt is hallowed, ſheweth one thing outwardly to human Senſes, and another thing they inwardly *call* to believing minds. Outwardly they appear Bread and Wine, both in figure and in taſte. clýp'aþ.

And they be truly after their hallowing Chriſt's Body and Blood through Ghoſtly Miſtery.

p. 33. So the Holy Font-Water, which is called the Well-Spring of Life, is like in ſhape to other Water, and

ſideretur ſolummodo quod corporeus aſpicit ſenſus, elementum fluidum conſpicitur, corruptioni ſubjectum, nec niſi corpora lavandi potentiam obtinere; ſed acceſſit Sancti Spiritus per Sacerdotis conſecrationem virtus, & efficax facta eſt non ſolum corpora, verum etiam animas diluere, & ſpirituales Sordes ſpirituali potentia dimovere.

§ 18. *Ecce in uno eodemque elemento duo videmus in eſſe ſibi reſiſtentia — in proprietate eſt humor corruptibilis, in Myſterio vero virtus ſanabilis.*

§ 19. *Sic itaque Chriſti corpus & ſanguis ſuperficie tenus conſiderata, creatura eſt, mutabilitati corruptelaque obnoxia, ſi Myſterii vero perpendis virtutem, vita eſt participantibus ſe tribuens immortalitatem.*

§ 69. *Multa differentia ſeparantur corpus in quo paſſus eſt Chriſtus——— & hoc corpus quod in myſterio Paſſionis Chriſti, quotidie a fidelibus celebratur——*

§ 72. *Illa namque Caro quæ Crucifixa eſt, de Virginis carne facta eſt oſſibus & nervis compacta, humanorum membrorum lineamentis diſtincta; rationalis animæ ſpiritu vivificata in propriam*

and ſubject to corruption, but the Holy Ghoſts might cometh to the corruptible Water through the Prieſt bleſſing, and it may afterwards waſh the Body and Soul from all ſin through Ghoſtly might.

Behold, now we ſee two things in this one Creature. After true nature, that Water is corruptible moiſture; and after Ghoſtly Myſtery, hath hallowing might.

So alſo if we behold the Holy Houſel [or Sacrament] after bodily ſenſe, then we ſee that it is a Creature corruptible and mutable; if we acknowledge therein Ghoſtly might, then underſtand we that Life is therein, and that it giveth immortality to them that eat it with Faith.

p. 35. Much difference is betwixt the Body in which Chriſt ſuffered, and the Body which is hallowed to houſel. The Body truly in which Chriſt ſuffered, was born of the Fleſh of *Mary*, with Blood, with Bones, with Skin, with Sinews, with human Limbs, and with a reaſonable Soul living.

priam vitam. At vero caro ſpiritualis quæ populum credentem paſcit ſecundum ſpeciem quam gerit exterius, frumenti granis manu artificis conſiſtit, nullis nervis, obſibuſque compacta, nulla membrorum varietate diſtincta, nulla rationali ſubſtantia vegetata : Quicquid enim in ea vita præbet ſubſtantiam ſpiritualis eſt potentiæ & inviſibilis efficientiæ, divinæque virtutis. Atque aliud longe conſiſtit ſecundum quod exterius conſpicitur, & illud ſecundum quod in Myſterio creditur.

§ 76. *Corpus Chriſti quod mortuum eſt, reſurrexit & immortale factum eſt* jam non moritur & mors illi ultra non dominabitur. *Æternum eſt jam, non paſſibile. Hoc autem quod in Eccleſia celebratur, temporale eſt non æternum, corruptibile eſt non incorruptum*—— *ſed* § 77. *negari non poteſt corrumpi quod per partes comminutum diſpartitur ad ſumendum & dentibus commolitum in corpus trajicitur.*

§ 88. *Hoc Corpus* [*ſc. quod in Myſterio celebratur*] *pignus eſt & ſpecies, illud veritas. Hoc enim geritur donec*

ad

living. And his Ghoſtly Body, which we call the Houſel, is gathered of many Corns without Blood and Bone, without Limb, and without Soul——— whatſoever is in that Houſel that giveth the ſubſtance of Life, that is of the Ghoſtly might and inviſible operation. And therefore is the Holy Houſel called a Myſtery, becauſe there is one thing in it ſeen, and another thing underſtood. p. 36.

p. 37. Certainly Chriſt's Body, in which he ſuffered Death, and roſe again from Death, never dieth henceforth, but is Eternal and Impaſſible. But that Houſel is Temporal, not Eternal; corruptible, and divided into ſeveral parts, chew'd betwixt the Teeth, and ſent into the Belly.

p. 38. This Myſtery is a pledge and a * Figure, Chriſt's Body is the Truth itſelf. This Pledge we keep myſtically, until we be come to the

* Hip, and not as above Getacnunge, which is a figure in ſpeech.

p. 68. *Quod dente premitur, fauce glutitur, quod receptaculo ventris ſuſcipitur.*

Truth

ad illud perveniatur, ubi vero ad illud perventum fuerit, hoc removebitur.

§ 60. *Corpus Christi est, sed non corporaliter, sanguis Christ est, sed non corporaliter.*

§ 25. *Nec istic ratio qua fieri potuit est disquirenda, sed fides quod factum sit adhibenda.*

§ 25. *Ipse namque qui nunc in Ecclesia omnipotenti virtute Panem & Vinum in sui corporis carnem & proprii cruoris undam spiritualiter convertit, ipse tunc quoque Manna de Cœlo datum Corpus suum & Aquam de Petra profusam proprium sanguinem invisibiliter operatus est.*——

§ 27. *Dominus Jesus Christus priusquam pateretur accepto pane gratias egit & dedit discipulis suis dicens, Hoc est Corpus meum, &c. Videmus nondum passum esse Christum, & jam tamen sui corporis & sanguinis Mysterium operatum fuisse.*—— § 28. *Sicut ergo paulo antequam pateretur panis substantiam & vini creaturam convertere potuit in proprium corpus quod Passurum erat, & in*

suum

Truth itſelf, then is that Pledge ended.

Truly it is ſo as we ſaid before, Chriſt's Body and Blood not Bodily but Ghoſtly. See *p.* 35.

You ſhould not ſearch how it is done, but hold in Faith that it is ſo done.

p. 43. We ſaid to you erewhile, that Chriſt hallowed Bread and Wine to Houſel before his Suffering, and ſaid, This is my Body and my Blood. He had not ſuffered as yet, he turned through inviſible might that Bread to his own Body, and that Wine to his own Blood, as formerly he did in the Wilderneſs before that he was born to Men, when he turned that Heavenly Meat to his Fleſh, and that Water flowing from the Rock to his own Blood.

That which next follows, is a quotation out of St. *Auguſtine*, which it is very likely that *Elfrick* took from *Bertram*, and not at firſt hand from that Father.

p. 44. *Mo-*

ſuum ſanguinem qui poſt fundendus extabat, ſic etiam in deſerto Manna & Aquam de Petra in ſuam carnem & ſanguinem convertere prævaluit, quamvis longe poſt & caro illius in Cruce pro nobis pendenda, & ſanguis ejus —— fundendus ſuperabat.

§ 78. *Manducavit & Moſes Manna, manducavit & Aaron, manducavit & Phinees, manducaverunt & multi qui Deo placuerunt & mortui non ſunt: Quare? quia viſibilem cibum ſpiritualiter intellexerunt, ſpiritualiter eſurierunt, ſpiritualiter guſtaverunt, ut ſpiritualiter ſatiarentur.*

§ 39. *Quod fecit ſemel nunc quotidie frequentat, ſemel enim pro peccatis populi ſe obtulit, celebratur tamen hæc eadem oblatio ſingulis per fideles diebus, ſed in myſterio, ut quod Dominus Jeſus Chriſtus ſemel ſeſe offerens adimplevit, hoc in ejus Paſſionis memoriam quotidie geritur per myſteriorum celebrationem.*

§ 73. *Conſiderandum quoque quod in illo pane non ſolum corpus Chriſti, verum corpus etiam in eum credentis populi figuretur.*

§ 95. *Et —— ſic dicit in conſequentibus, Corpus ergo Chriſti vultis Intelligere*

p. 44. *Moſes* and *Aaron*, and many others of that People which pleaſed God, eat that Heavenly Bread, and they died not that Everlaſting death, [though they died the common death] they ſaw that the Heavenly Meat [*viz.* *Manna*] was viſible and corruptible, and they underſtood ſomewhat Spiritual by that viſible thing, and Spiritually received it.

p. 46. Once Chriſt ſuffered in himſelf, and yet nevertheleſs his ſuffering is daily renewed, through the Myſtery of the Holy Houſel at the Holy Maſs.

p. 47. We ought alſo to conſider diligently, how this Holy Houſel, is both Chriſt's Body, and the Body of all Faithful Men after Ghoſtly Myſtery, as Wiſe *Auguſtine* ſaith, *If you will underſtand of Chriſt's Body, hear*

telligere Apoſtolum audite dicentem vos eſtis corpus Chriſti & Membra— Myſterium veſtrum in menſa Domini poſitum eſt. Myſterium Domini accipitis ad id quod eſtis Amen *reſpondetis, & reſpondendo ſubſcribitis. Audis ergo* Corpus Chriſti *& reſpondes* Amen *eſto membrum Chriſti ut verum ſit Amen——ipſum Paulum dicentem audiamus,* unus Panis & unum Corpus multi ſumus.

§ 75 *Sic in vino qui Sanguis Chriſti dicitur, aqua miſceri* jubetur, *nec unum ſine altero permittitur offerri quia nec populus ſine Chriſto, nec Chriſtus ſine populo ſicut nec caput ſine corpore, nec corpus ſine capite valet exiſtere. Aqua denique in illo Sacramento populi geſtat imaginem.*

the Apoſtle Paul *thus ſpeaking, Ye truly be Chriſt's Body and his Members.* Now is your Myſtery ſet on God's Table, and ye receive your Myſtery, which Myſtery ye be yourſelves, be that which you ſee on the Altar, and receive that which yourſelves be. And again, St. *Paul* ſaith, *We many, be one Bread, and one Body.*——— p. 48.

* Holy Books *command* that Water be mingled with Wine, which ſhall be for Houſel, becauſe the Water ſignifieth the People, and the Wine Chriſt's Blood, therefore ſhall not the one without the other be offered at the Holy Maſs. That Chriſt may be with us, and we with Chriſt; the Head with the Limbs, and the Limbs with the Head. *p.* 51.

* *i.e. Canons* Eccleſiaſtical, not the Holy Scripture.

And after theſe words our Homiliſt reſumes his former Diſcourſe of the Paſchal Lamb.

Thus have I at large ſet down in Parallel, the Paſſages of that *Saxon* Homily taken out of *Bertram*. The (*a*) Sermon was originally *Latin*, which *Elfrick* tranſlated into *Saxon*; whether he were the Compiler in *Latin*, I cannot be poſitive. But it ſeems the ſucceeding Ages would not bear this Doctrine, for which reaſon the *Latin* is utterly loſt; either being wilfully made away, or the Governors of our Church not thinking it fit to tranſcribe and propagate what, after the condemnation of *Berengarius*, and the promotion of his great Adverſary *Lanfranc* to the Archbiſhoprick of *Canterbury*, was generally reputed Hereſie. But through the wonderful good Providence of God, the whole is preſerved in the *Saxon* Tongue, which few underſtood.

By this account of that Homily, you learn Two things, and a Third Obſervation I ſhall add.

1. That *Bertram*'s Book was neither forged by *Oecolampadius*, nor yet depraved by *Berengarius* or *Wiclef* his Diſciples, ſince the moſt expreſs Paſſages againſt the Popiſh *Real Preſence*

(*a*) See the Preface of the Homily.

are

are read in that Homily 70 or 80 years before *Berengarius* made any noiſe in the World.

2. What I deſign to inſiſt upon more largely in the laſt Chapter of this Diſcourſe, *viz.* That *Ratramnus* or *Bertram* ſtood not alone, but had others of the ſame judgment with him in the IX and X Century, and that *Paſchaſius* his Doctrine had not received as yet the ſtamp of publick Authority, either by any Popes or Councels confirmation.

3. Nevertheleſs this carnal Doctrine of *Paſchaſius* did daily get ground in that obſcure and ignorant Age next that he lived in, as may appear by ſome Paſſages in this Homily (which I have not recited, becauſe they are not in *Bertram*) the abſurd conſequences of that errour. For inſtance, *p.* 39 and 40, there are two Miracles inſerted to prove the Carnal Preſence contrary to the ſcope of the whole Diſcourſe, and the one contrary to their own Doctrine of Chriſt's Preſence. (*a*) They tell you of a Woman whoſe doubts touching the Real

(*a*) This Miracle is found in *Paſchaſ Radbert de Corp. & Sang. Dom. in Bibl. Patrum. Par.* 1610. *Tom. VI. c.* 14.

Preſence, were cured at the Prayers of St. *Gregory*, at whoſe requeſt God cauſed the Hoſt ſhe was about to receive, to appear as though there lay in the diſh a joynt of a Finger all Bloody. Whereas, according to the Popiſh Doctrine, *Chriſt's* (*b*) *whole Body, Soul and Divinity is in every bit of the Hoſt, and drop of the conſecrated Wine*; and this Miracle, if it proves any thing, muſt prove the contrary.

Again, our Homiliſt in the beginning of *p.* 47. ſaith immediatly after thoſe words cited by me out of the 46 page. *Therefore the Holy Maſs is profitable both to the quick and to the dead.* The propitiatory Sacrifice was by this time ſet on foot, which neceſſarily ſuppoſeth the Corporal Preſence of Chriſt. But it is worth obſerving, however, that the Adoration of the Sacrament ſprang not up till ſome Ages after, it being not mentioned either by *Radbertus* or *Ratramnus*, or *Elfrick* in this Homily.

3. The Third Opinion, maintained by thoſe who do not condemn our Author, though they do this Book, is, that it is not the Work of *Ratramnus*, but of *Joannes Scotus*. And ſo it may

(*b*) *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 13. *Can.* 3.

be

be for ought I have hitherto ſaid, in regard he was more Ancient than our *Saxon* Homiliſt, and equal with *Bertram*.

This Opinion was firſt delivered by the Learned (*a*) *Peter de Marca*, and is urged with great confidence by a (*b*) Monk of St. *Genouefe*, whoſe Modeſty *M. Arnaud* tells us cauſed him to conceal his Name.

This Diſſertator makes a great duſt with his Conjectures, and would perſwade us that *Bertram* and *Ratramnus* are not the ſame Perſon, by reaſon of the variety of Names given him, as I have ſhewn in the beginning of this Diſcourſe; but this is a poor ſhift, for every one knows how differently Writers report the Names of Men who flouriſh'd in that Age, and in thoſe Parts of *France*; and where the Authors make no difference, it often happens by the Tranſcribers miſtake: One would think the Inſtance he gives of *Cellot*'s Anonymous Writer, who in his firſt leaf calls the Adverſaries of *Paſchaſius*, *Rabanus* and

(*a*) *P. de Marca in Epiſtola. Apud Dicherium in Spicil. Tom.* 2. (*b*) At the end of Mr. *Arnaud*'s Defence, in *quarto. Par.* 1669. *Diſſert.* 1. The Author is Mr. *Paris.*

Ratramnus, and in the next *Rabanus* and *Intramus*, might have ſuppreſſed that Objection.

In the next Section, he ſaith, *Trithemius* and *Sigebert* make *Bertram* to have written but one Book of Predeſtination, whereas *Ratramnus* wrote two, and that the two MSS. mentioned by *Suffridus Petrus*, may be falſe written: And I may better ſay, they are not; for he names neither more, nor elder Copies that make it out. As for the preciſe number of Books, *Sigebert*, and more curious Men, are not always exact, but many times, where the Work is ſmall, call two Books, becauſe one Work, *a Book*, ſo *Sigebert* ſaith, and not *one Book*.

Al Carolum librum de Prædeſtin.

In his Third Section, this Monk of St. *Genouefe* gives us nothing but a taſte of his Modeſty, in taxing the incomparable *Uſher* of falſe dealing, and telling the World that his Teſtimony is of no credit concerning a raſure out of a Manuſcript he had ſeen at *Cambridge*, and wonders he hath the confidence to hope that his bare word ſhould be taken for it, after his falſe dealing about *Ratramnus* his Book of *Chriſt's Birth*, without telling how the Paſſage raſed was recovered.

In

In the laſt Section, he offers toward an Anſwer to the Reaſons that induced Father *Cellot* to conclude *Ratramnus Corbeienſis* the Author of thoſe Books which paſs under the Name of *Bertram*; I could, were it worth while, ſhew the inſufficiency of his Anſwers, and would do it, but that I have in reſerve ſuch Teſtimonies from F. *Mabillon*, as will baffle all his amuſing Conjectures, and to which any man of *modeſty* will ſubmit.

This he offers to prove, that *Bertram* is not *Ratramnus*. To make good the other part of his undertaking, and ſhew that *Joannes Scotus* is the Author of this Book, he ſuggeſts Three things.

1. That this Book is agreeable to the account that is given of *Scotus* his Book, whoſe Authority *Berengarius* uſed.

2. That the ſtyle and manner of arguing, are *Scotus* his peculiar way.

3. That the Diſciples of *Berengarius*, after *Scotus* his Book was condemned, in the Synods at *Vercelli* and *Rome*, gave it the diſguiſed Name of *Bertram*,

Bertram, to preſerve it from the flames.

His Arguments from the account given of *Scotus* his Book, are well anſwered by F. *Mabillon*; and all I ſhall ſay, is, what he omits, *viz.* That the Doctrine of *Scotus*, according to the beſt accounts we can have of it, is not agreeable to that of *Bertram*; for if F. *Alexander* and others are not Miſtaken in (*a*) *Hincmarus* his meaning, he taught that the *Sacrament was only a Memory of Chriſt's Body and Blood*, which this Diſſertator, to give us a Specimen of his *Honeſty*, as he did before of his *Modeſty*, changes into a *naked figure without any ſort of Truth*, and expreſly contrary to his Sentiments, imputes to *Bertram* as his Doctrine.

2. The ſtyle of *Bertram* and *Scotus* are not at all alike: *Scotus* is full of Greek words, and notions and citations out of the Greek Fathers, which *Bertram* is free from. His way of

(*a*) *Quod Sacramenta Altaris non verum Corpus & verus Sanguis ſit Domini, ſed tantum memoria veri Corporis & Sanguinis ejus, de Præd. c.* 31.

Argu-

Arguing is not Syllogiſtical, as *Bertram*'s, ſo far as I can obſerve by his Books *De Naturis*. And his notion, That *Chriſt's glorified Body is abſorpt in the Divine Nature, and is not local, nor viſible, nor had the ſame Members after its Reſurrection which it had before*, will quite overthrow many of *Bertram*'s Arguments, to prove that in the Sacrament is not exhibited the ſame Body in which he died and roſe again. *Scotus de Diviſione Naturæ, l. 5 N. XX. Item l. 2. n. XI.*

His Third ſuggeſtion is a meer Conjecture, and a very weak one. For if *Berengarius* his Diſciples feigned that Name to preſerve the Book from the fire, What uſe did they preſerve it for? What ſervice did it ever do them? Who ever mentions any of them that alledged *Bertram*'s Authority? How comes it to paſs that no Copies of it were preſerved in the Southern Parts of *France*, where the *Albigenſes* and *Waldenſes*, *Berengarius* Diſciples, have abounded in all times ever ſince? It is much they ſhould not ſave one Copy of *Bertram*.

But ſince he is Conjecturing, Why may not I offer a Conjecture or two in this matter? 1. Why might not

Ber-

Bertram's Book through miſtake both with *Berengarius* and his Adverſaries, paſs under the Name of *Scotus*? It is not impoſſible, but I inſiſt not upon it. 2. It is very probable that when the Synods of *Vercellis* and *Rome* condemned *Scotus* his Book to the flames, thoſe who had the execution of the Decree, eſpecially in *Normandy* and *England*, *Lanfranc*'s Province, might burn *Bertram* for company, and occaſion the preſent ſcarcity of Manuſcripts.

But to ſilence all theſe pretences, and ſhew that *Bertram*'s Book is no Forgery, not corrupted by Heretical mixtures, nor yet written by *Scotus*, but *Ratramnus*, Monk of *Corbey*; I ſhall cloſe this Chapter, with the ingenuous acknowledgment of the Learned and honeſt F. *Mabillon*, who ſaith, *Travelling in the* Netherlands, *I went to the Monaſtery of* Lobez, *where, among the few Manuſcripts now remaining, I found two. One Book written* 800 *years ſince, containing two pieces, one of the Lord's Body and Blood, and the other of Predeſtination; the former one Book, the latter two. The Inſcription and beginnings of both were thus in the Manuſcript*; Thus begins the Book of

A. Ben. Sec. IV. p. 2. Præf. p. 45. n. 83.

of *RATRAMNUS*, of the Body and Blood of the Lord. You commanded me, Glorious Prince. *At the end of this Book.* Thus begins the Book of *RATRAMNUS* concerning God's Predeſtination. To his Glorious Lord, and moſt Excellent King *Charles*, *RATRAMNUS*, &c. *As in the Printed Book. The other Book was a Catalogue of the Library of Lobez, with this Title, A. D.* 1049. The Friars of *Lobez* taking an account of the Library, find in it theſe Books—— *Ratramnus* of the Lord's Body and Blood one Book. The ſame Author of God's Predeſtination, two Books, *which gives us to underſtand, that the Book which contains theſe pieces of* Ratramnus *is the very ſame ſet down in the Catalogue A. D.* 1049. *and written before that time; and by the hand, it appears to have been written a little before the IX Century. And I doubt not but it is the very Book which* Herigerus *Abbot of* Lobez *uſed at the end of the X Century.*

Therefore it is not Jo. Scotus.

This is full proof that *Ratramnus* is the Author, and that the Book is no modern Forgery, being 800 years old.

Well,

Well, but hath it not been corrupted and interpolated by Hereticks? Let F. *Mabillon* anſwer again touching the ſincerity of the Editions of this Book; *I compared* (ſaith he) *the* Lobez *Manuſcript with the Printed Books; and the reading is true, except in ſome faulty places, which I corrected by the Excellent* Lobez *Manuſcript. There is* * *one word of ſome moment omitted——— which yet I will not ſay, was fraudulently left out by the Hereticks, the firſt Publiſhers of it, in regard, as I ſaid before, there appears not any thing of unfaithfulneſs in other places.*

Ibid. p. 64. *nu.* 130.

Thus doth this Learned and Ingenuous Benedictine teſtifie, that the Book we now publiſh, is a genuine piece of the IX Century, that *Ratrammus*, Monk of *Corbey*, is the true Author, and that his Work is come to our hands ſincere, and without Heretical mixtures either of *Berengarius* or *Wiclef*'s Diſciples.

(*a*) That word is *& exiſtit* p. which I have inſerted into the Text upon F. *Mabillon*'s Authority. Let the *Papiſts* make their beſt of it.

Beſides

(a) Beſide the *Lobez.* MS. the ſame Father in his *Germain* Voyage met with another in the Monaſtery of *Salem Weiler*, which he judgeth by the hand to be 700 years old. This gives the Title in the end, as the *Lobez.* MS. but in the beginning, ſtyleth it, *The Book of* Ratramne, *of Receiving the Lords Body and Blood. To* Charles *the Great.*

(a) *Mabil. Iter Germanicum præfixum Analect. Tom. IV. Incipit Liber Ratramni de perceptione Corporis & Sanguinis Domini ad Carolum Magnum.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the the true Senſe of the Author in ſome controverted Expreſſions.

BEfore we can comprehend the Sentiments of *Ratramnus* in the Controverſie depending between us and the Church of *Rome*, touching Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament, it will be neceſſary to ſettle and clear his true meaning in ſome Terms, which frequently occur in this Tract: Becauſe our Adverſaris, by abuſing the ambiguity of them, and expounding them according to the Prejudices wherewith Education hath poſſeſt them, ſeem to think *Bertram* their own, and charge us with impudence and folly in pretending to his Authority.

Thoſe Terms which are in the ſtate of the Queſtion, are the principal Keys of the whole Diſcourſe, and well underſtood, will open our Author's mind therein.

That

That * *which the mouth receiveth*, is the Subject of both Queſtions. Not what the Faithful receive any way, but what *their Teeth preſs*, *their Throat ſwalloweth*, and *their Bellies receive*. In what ſenſe the conſecrated Elements are Chriſt's Body and Blood? and whether his natural Body or not?

In the firſt Queſtion there are two oppoſite Terms, † *Figure* and *Truth*. Figure.

The word *Figure*, when applied to *Terms* or *Propoſitions*, is taken in a Rhetorical ſenſe, and implies thoſe Expreſſions not to be *proper*, but either *Metaphors*, or *Metonymies*, &c. as when *Chriſt* is called a *Vine*. When applied to *things*, as the *conſecrated Elements*, *Figure* and *Myſtery* are of the ſame ſignification, and imply the thing ſpoken of to be a *Sign* or *Repreſentation* of ſome other thing. And on the contrary, *Verity* or *Truth* in. Verity or Truth.

* *Quod in Eccleſia ore fidelium ſumitur Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti.* *Qu.* 1. § 5.

Quod ore fidelium per Sacramentorum Myſterium in Eccleſia quotidie ſumitur. *Q.* 2. *ſect.* 50.

† See them explain'd by *Bertram* himſelf. *ſect.* 7, 8. and him determining the Sacramental change to be *Figuratively* wrought, not *corporally*, ſect. 9, 16. and ſupporting himſelf by the Teſtimony of St. *Auguſtine de Doctr. Chriſt. l.* 3. *c.* 16.

this *Tract*, when applied to *Terms* or *Propoſitions*, ſignifies *Propriety of Speech*; but when applied to things, it imports **Truth of Nature*. So then *Ratramnus* determines the firſt Queſtion to this effect. That the words of our Saviour in the Inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt, are not to be taken *properly*, but *figuratively*; and that the conſecrated Elements orally received by the Faithful, are not the *True* Body of Chriſt, but the *Figure*, or Sacrament of it; though not meer empty figures, or naked ſigns, void of all Efficacy, but ſuch as through the Bleſſing annext to our Saviour's Inſtitution, and the powerful operation of the Spirit of Chriſt working in and by thoſe Sacred Figures, is the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

---

* *In Proprietate, Subſtantialiter, in manifeſtatione, Luce in veritatis ſimplicitate*, in this Tract, are equivalent to naturally, and in Verity of Nature. This the *Saxon* Homily very well clears, and as *ſuperficie tenus conſiderata* anſwers to *in proprietate* a little before in *Bertram*, ſect. 19. ſo in the *Saxon* Homily *ſuperficie tenus conſiderata* is rendred after *bodily underſtanding*, which anſwers to *true Nature* immediately preceding.

Beſides

Beſides this, *Verity* or *Truth* hath yet another ſence, as it ſtands oppoſed to a *Lye* or *Falſhood*: For a Propoſition is not immediately falſe, where the Prædicate is a *Metaphor* or *Metonymy*, and doth not in its firſt and native ſignification agree to the ſubject; for unleſs the Trope be too obſcure, it conveys the Speakers true meaning into the mind of ſuch as hear him. Another ſence of *Verity*.

Now in this ſence (*a*) St. *Auguſtine*, cited by our Author, ſaith, *he tells no Lye*, who giveth the Name of the thing itſelf to the Sign and Sacrament of it; and that this manner of ſpeaking was perfectly underſtood. And I may add, it was very familiar among the Jews, and is Authoriſed by a multitude of Scripture Examples. Now in this ſence *Ratramnus* in ſome places affirms, that the conſecrated Elements are *truly* Chriſt's Body and Blood, and this without the leaſt contradiction to himſelf, though in the other ſence he more frequently denies it. And a due regard to theſe two ſences of *Verity* or *Truth*, will

(*a*) *Non utique mentitur, &c. ſect.* 35. *& ſupra, cur nemo tam ineptus eſt ut nos ita loquentes arguat eſſe mentitos, &c.*

clear the obſcurity of which the *Romaniſts* accuſe our Author in many Paſſages of this Work.

Manifeſtation. There is another term of the ſame importance, *viz. Manifeſtation*; but our Adverſaries pretend it is a Key of the whole Work, becauſe *Ratramnus* defines Truth to be *rei manifeſtæ demonſtratio*, and charge the (a) *French* Tranſlator of falſifying the Author, becauſe he renders *manifeſtæ & manifeſta participatione*, *real* and *really*. They ſay, whatever is manifeſt is *real*, but the word *real* doth not expreſs the full notion of *manifeſt*, which further includes *evidence*, many things being *real* which are not *manifeſt*. And this is true. But yet *Bertram*'s ſence of the word muſt be judged by his own uſe of it, which will appear by inſpecting the ſeveral places of the Book where it occurs; and I muſt needs ſay, that I cannot make ſence of him, if he mean not as the *French* Tranſlator hath rendred him.

In the ſtate of the queſtion, where he explains *Verity*, by that which appears *manifeſtationis luce*, *in a mani-*

(a) *Mabilonius A.B. Sec. IV. P. 2. Præf. n.* 101.

feſt

feſt light, or *naked and open*, his meaning in that Queſtion, (or rather the meaning of thoſe againſt whom he writes, and whoſe error the firſt part of this Diſcourſe is intended to rectifie) cannot be; whether the Sacrament was the Body of Chriſt appearing in its own ſhape to our bodily Eye: For that Cardinal *Perron*, or Mr. *Arnaud* do not pretend the *Stercorariſts*, or whoever elſe *Bertram* oppoſeth, to have believed, but that the accidents of Bread and Wine affected, or were ſubjected in the natural Body and Blood of Chriſt. Now as to the matter of the Manifeſt appearance of Chriſt's Body, it is all one, whether the accidents of Bread and Wine be ſubjected in the Body and Blood of Chriſt, or ſubſiſt without a ſubject; for the bodily Eye doth not behold the Body of Chriſt, the more or leſs manifeſtly for that; nor doth it at all *manifeſtly* behold Chriſt's Body, unleſs it ſee him in the form of a Man. And therefore if they meant any thing, it muſt be, whether the ſenſible Object in the Sacrament were Chriſt's very Body, though under the figure of the Sacramental Elements.

But to clear the point, we need only compare the two Prayers in the close of *Bertram*'s Discourse on the second Question, and we shall find, that what in one Prayer they beg of God to receive by a *manifest participation*, in the other they pray to be made *really partakers of*; and in the same Collect, *manifest participation* is opposed to Receiving in a *Sacramental Image*: Now there is nothing more naturally opposed to an *Image*, than the *very thing* whose Image it is, or to a Sacrament, than the *res Sacramenti*, the real Object signified and exhibited under it. The Reader will find the word bears the same sence in those few other places where *Ratramnus* useth it, which are all near the end of the Book.

Species. Another controverted Term is *Species*, which hath two sences in this Book. It is most commonly used to signifie *the kind*, and *specifical nature* of any thing, and is always so taken where it is set in opposition to a *Figure*, or *Sacrament*, or where the Author is declaring the nature of the consecrated Elements.

Sometimes it signifies the appearance or likeness of a thing; so it is taken

taken when it is oppoſed to *Truth*, as in the Poſt-Communion Prayer cited by *Ratramnus*, and in his Inferences from it.

Beſides theſe, the *Romaniſts* have another acceptation of the word, making it to ſignifie the ſenſible qualities of the conſecrated Elements ſubſiſting without their ſubſtance, in which ſence I poſitively affirm, that *Species* is no where uſed in this Treatiſe. And herein the Authors of the (*a*) *Belgick* Index will bear me out, *who acknowledge that* Bertram *did not exactly know how Accidents could ſubſiſt out of their Subjects, which ſubtil Truth latter Ages have learnt out of the Scripture.*

As *Species* ordinarily ſignifies Nature, ſo the addition of *Viſibilis* alters not its ſignification. For *Ratramnus* doth not ſpeak of thoſe qualities which immediately affect the ſence abſtracted from their Subject. And I know nothing in Reaſon, nor yet in the Holy Scriptures, which are the Rule of our Faith, that can inforce us to believe that our Senſes are not

Species viſibilis.

(*a*) *Index Expurg. Belg. in Bertramo. tametſi non diffitear Bertramum tunc temporis neſciviſſe exacte accidentia iſta abſque omni ſubſtantia ſua ſubſiſtere, &c.*

as true Judges of what the Mouth receiveth in the Sacrament, as they are of the nature of any other Object whatsoever, and may as easily discern whether it be Bread or Flesh, as they can distinguish a Man from a Tree.

Divine Word.

Our Author frequently mentions the *Divine Word*, by whose power the Sacred Elements are *Spiritually changed* into Christ's Body. Now when he thus speaks, we must not imagine, that he means a natural change of the Substance of the thing consecrated by the *efficacy of the words of consecration*, but a Spiritual change effected by the Power and Spirit of Christ, who is *God the Word*, as he explains himself.

Spiriutal Eody.

The last Term that needs explaining, is Christ's *Spiritual Body*; this he affirms the Sacrament to be in many places. Now by a *Spiritual Body*, we are not to understand the natural Body of Christ, but existing after the manner of a Spirit, or as our Adversaries love to speak, not according to its proper existence, that is to say, it is Christ's Natural Body, but neither visible nor local, nor extended; this is not *Bertram*'s sence of *Christ's Spiritual Body*, but that the thing so called,

called, is *Figuratively* and *Myſtically* Chriſt's Body, and that it *Spiritually* communicates to the Faithful, *Chriſt with all the benefits of his Death.*

I may alſo add, that *Bertram* uſes great variety of Phraſes to expreſs that which we call the outward ſign in the Sacrament, *that which the outward ſenſe beholds, that which the bodily eye ſeeth, that which is outwardly ſeen or done corporeal, that which the Teeth preſs, or the Mouth receives, that which feeds the Body, that which appears outwardly*, importing the ſenſible qualities to be all that we have to judge the nature of viſible Objects by, its extenſion and figure, its colour, its ſmell, its taſte, its ſolidity, *&c.* None of thoſe Phraſes imply the Accidents without the Subſtance, but they are deſcriptions of the Sacramental Symbols or outward Signs.

And to theſe are oppoſed, *that which faith, or the eyes of the mind only beholds, that which we believe, that which is inwardly contained, or Spiritually ſeen or done, that which faith receives, the ſecret vertue latent in the Sacrament, the ſaving benefits of it, that which feeds the Soul, and miniſters the Suſtenance of eternal life*, all expreſſions equivalent to the

the thing *ſignified*, or the *grace wrought by the Sacrament*. Alſo *inviſibly* and *inwardly* are generally of the ſame ſignification with *ſpiritually*.

Theſe are the Terms whoſe Ambiguity Popiſh Writers commonly abuſe, when they go about to perſuade us, that *Ratrammus* in this Book aſſerts the *Real Preſence, in the ſence of the Roman Church*, and is for *Tranſubſtantiation*, which any Man that reads him, will find as difficult to believe, as Tranſubſtantiation itſelf.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

That this Treatiſe expreſly Confutes the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, and is very agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of England.

IT being acknowledg'd by (*a*) *Bellarmine*, that the firſt who wrote expreſly and at large, concerning the Verity of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt, was *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, (though he and *Poſſevine*, to mention no more, miſtake groſly, in ſaying, that he wrote againſt *Bertram*,) and *Sirmondus* confeſſeth that he was the firſt who explained the (*b*) genuine ſence of the Catholick Church, ſo

(*a*) *Bellarm. de Script. Eccleſ. de Paſchaſio Radberto ad A. D.* 850

(*b*) *Genuinum Eccleſiæ Catholicæ ſenſum ita primus explicuit ut viam cæteris aperuerit, qui de eodem argumento multi poſtea ſcripſere. Sirmond. in vita Paſchaſii præfixa operibus, in Folio, Par.* 1618.

as

as to open the way for others, who have ſince written on that Subject. It will not be amiſs, before I propoſe diſtinctly the Doctrins of the Church of *Rome* and our own Church, that I ſay ſomewhat of *Radbertus*, and his ſentiments, which our Adverſaries own to be a true Expoſition of the ſence of their Church.

That *Bertram* (as *Bellarmine* tells us) was the firſt that called Tranſubſtantiation in Queſtion, we are not much to wonder, ſince *Radbertus* was the firſt that broach'd that Errour in the *Weſtern* Church, and no Errour can be written againſt, till it be publiſhed. And (a) *Herigerus* tells us, that not only *Ratrammus*, but alſo *Rabanus* wrote againſt him, and by comparing circumſtances of time, I ſhall ſhew that his Book did not long paſs uncontradicted. If we look into the

(a) *Contra quem* [*i. e. Paſchaſium*] *ſatis argumentantur & Rabanus in Epiſtola ad Egilonem Abbatem & Ratramnus libro compoſito ad Carolum Regem. Apud Cellotium Opuſc. II. cap.* 1.

Preface

Preface of * *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, it is eaſie to obſerve that the Book is not controverſal but didactical; and though dedicated to *Warinus* once his Scholar, but then Abbot of *New Corbey*, yet it was written in a plain and low ſtyle, as deſigned for the Inſtruction of the Monks of *New Corbey*, (as much *Novices in Chriſtianity*, as in the Religion of St. *Benedict*, and not ſo much as initiated in any ſort of good literature,) and to teach them the Doctrine of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament.

This *New Corbey* was Founded by St. *Adelardus*, the next year after his return from Exile, *viz. A. D.* 822. and the place choſen as conveniently ſeated for the propagation of Chriſtianity among the Pagan *Saxons*, lately Conquer'd by *Charles the Great*, and *Ludovicus Pius*. And therefore

* *Vide Epiſtolum ad Carolum apud Mabillonium Act. Ben. Sec.* 4. *p.* 2. *p.* 135. Placidio meo, Warino Abbati. *Quem etiam Abbatem fuiſſe conſtat ex Prologo Paſchaſii.* Ideo ſic communius volui ſtilo temperare ſubulco, ut ea quæ de Sacramento Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti ſunt neceſſaria reſcire, quos necdum unda liberalium attigerat literarum, vitæ pabulum & ſalutis hauſtum planius caperent ad medelam. *Ibidem.*

this

this Book of * *Radbertus* could not be written, as ſome conjecture, during the Baniſhment of *Adelardus*, which laſted ſeven years, from 814. to 821. In regard the Society, for whoſe uſe it was written, was not erected till afterwards. Nor was *Warinus* (to whom *Radbert* gives the Name of *Placidius*, as he did to himſelf the Name of *Paſchaſius*,) Abbot till the Death of *Adelardus*, *A. D.* 826. The ground of the miſtake, was the Opinion that prevailed till the Lives of *Adelardus* and *Wala*, written by *Radbertus*, were publiſhed by F. *Mabillon*, *viz.* That † *Arſenius*, mentioned in the Prologue, was *Adelardus*, whereas now it appears that *Radbertus* conſtantly calls *Adelardus* by the Name of *Antonius*, and *Wala* his Brother and Succeſſor in the Government of *Old Corbey*, by that of *Arſenius*, and it was during *Wala*'s Baniſhment that *Paſchaſius* wrote his Book *de Corpore & Sanguine Domini*, or as he ſtyles it of the *Sacraments*, which happened *A. D.* 830. and laſted two years, ſo

* *Vide Mabillonium A. B. ſec. 4. p. 2. Præf. de Paſchaſ. Radberto, & in Elogio Hiſtorico ejuſdem.* † *Ex vita S. Walæ à Paſchaſio Radberto ſcriptæ.*

that

that *Paſchaſius* his Book may be ſuppoſed to have been written *A. D.* 831. that is, thirteen years later than formerly it was thought.

But though the Book was then firſt written on this occaſion, * *Paſchaſius* to recommend his Doctrine with the better advantage by his own Dignity, and the Authority of his Prince, ſometime after his Promotion to the Abby of *Corbey*, writes an Epiſtle to *Carolus Calvus*, and ſends him this Book, though written many years before, as a Preſent or New-Years Gift.

Upon the receipt of this, it is highly probable, that *Carolus Calvus* propounded thoſe two Queſtions to *Ratramnus*, and upon his Anſwer thoſe feuds might grow in the Monaſtery of *Corbey*, which made *Paſchaſius* weary of the Place, and reſign his Abby in the year 851. in which

* *Nunc autem dirigere non timui vobis, quatenus nobis operis præſtantior per vos exuberet fructus mercedis pro ſudore, cum per vos ad plurimos pervenerit commendatus. Paſch. Radbert. in Ep. ad Carolum, apud Mabillon, ſec. 4. p. 2. p. 135. & p. 136. Et ut hoc diligentius perlegat veſtre Sagax intelligentia —— proſtatis imploro precibus, quatenus veſtro examine comprobatus Codex, exſi jamdudum ad plurimos pervenit, deinceps ſecurius haberi poſſit.*

Sirmon-

Sirmondus ſuppoſeth he died, but F. *Mabillon* gives good reaſons to prove that he lived till 865. That the Controverſies about the Sacrament made him weary of his Abby, is F. *Mabillon*'s conjecture, and not mine. And if ſo, we have reaſon to believe, that the Doctrine of *Ratramnus* had rather the Princes countenance, and the ſtronger party in the Convent. And it will yet ſeem more probable; when we conſider that *Odo*, afterwards Biſhop of *Beauvais*, a great Friend of *Ratramnus*, was made Abbot in the room of *Paſchaſius*. What the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius* was, I ſhall now briefly ſhew.

He ſaith, * *That although in the Sacrament there be the Figure of Bread and Wine, yet we muſt believe it after conſecration to be nothing elſe but the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* And that you may know in what ſence he underſtands it to be Chriſt's Body and Blood, he adds, *And to ſay ſomewhat*

* *Paſch. Radb. de Corp. & Sang. Dom. c. 1. Licet Figura Panis & Vini hic ſit, omnino nihil aliud quam Caro Chriſti & Sanguis poſt conſecrationem credenda ſunt. —— Et ut mirabilius loquar, non alia planè, quam quæ nata eſt de Maria & paſſa in Cruce, & reſurrexit de Sepulchro. ——*

yet

yet more wonderful. It is no other Fleſh than that which was born of Mary, *ſuffered on the Croſs, and roſe again from the Grave.*

He illuſtrates this Myſtery further by intimating, *that whoſoever will not believe Chriſts natural Body in the Sacrament under the ſhape of Bread, that man would not have believed Chriſt himſelf to have been God, if he had ſeen him hanging upon the Croſs in the form of a Servant.* And ſhelters himſelf againſt all the Abſurdities that could be objected againſt this Opinion, as the Papiſts ſtill do under God's Omnipotence, laying down this Principle as the foundation of all his Diſcourſe, That *the nature of all Creatures is obedient to the Will of God, who can change them into what he pleaſeth.* He renders theſe two Reaſons, why the miraculous change is not manifeſt to ſenſe, by any alteration of the viſible form or taſt of what is received, *viz.* * *That there may be ſome exerciſe for Faith, and that* Pagans *might not have ſubject to*

* *Sic debuit hoc myſterium temperari, ut & arcana Secretorum celarentur infidis & meritum creſceret de virtute Fidei,* c. 13. *ubi plura ejuſmodi occurrunt.*

blaſpheme the Myſteries of our Religion. Yet notwithſtanding this, no man who believes the Word of God, ſaith he, *can doubt but by Conſecration, it is made Chriſt's Body and Blood* in *Verity* or *Truth of Nature.* And he alledgeth ſtories of the miraculous appearance of Chriſt's Fleſh in its proper form for the cure of doubting, as a further confirmation of his carnal Doctrine.

Theſe are the ſentiments of *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, and differ little from thoſe of the Roman Church at preſent, which I ſhall deduce from the Authentick Acts of that Church, eſpecially the Council of *Trent.*

1. In the Year 1059. there was a Council aſſembled at *Rome* by Pope *Nicolaus* the II, in which a form of Recantation was drawn up for *Berengarius*, wherein he was required to declare, * *That Bread and Wine after Conſecration, are not only the Sacrament, Sign and Figure, but the very Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is not only Sacramentally,*

* *Apud Gratianum de Conſecratione. Diſt.* 2. *c.* 42. *Ego Berengarius*, &c.

but

but Senſibly and Truly handled and broken by the Prieſts hands, and ground by the Teeth of the Faithful: And this being the form of a Recantation, ought to be eſteemed an accurate account of the Doctrine of the Church, yet they are ſomewhat aſhamed of it, as may appear by the Gloſs upon *Gratian*, who hath put it into the body of the Canon Law. But the Council of *Trents* difinitions are more Authentick, which hath determined,

I. *If any one ſhall deny that in the moſt Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt there is contained really and ſubſtantially, the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and conſequently whole Chriſt; But ſhall ſay that it is therein contained only as in a Sign, or Figure, or Virtually, let him be accurſed.*

II. *If any one ſhall ſay, that in the Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt there remains the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, together with the Body or Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and ſhall deny that ſingular or wonderful converſion of the whole ſubſtance of Bread into his Body, and of the whole ſubſtance of*

1. *Concil. Trid. ſeſſ.* 13. *can.* 1.
2. *Conc. Trid. Ibid. c.* 2.

Wine into his Blood, there remaining only the ſpecies, i. e. *Accidents of Bread and Wine, which converſion the Catholick Church very aptly calls Tranſubſtantiation, let him be accurſed.*

i. e. By faith and not orally.

III. *If any man ſhall ſay, that in the Euchariſt Chriſt is exhibited, and eaten, only Spiritually, and not Sacramentally and Really, let him be accurſed.*

Theſe are the definitions of the Church of *Rome* in this matter, and now let us ſee whether the Doctrine of *Ratramnus* in this Book be agreeable to theſe Canons.

I might make ſhort work of it, by alledging all thoſe Authors who either repreſent him as a Heretick, or his Book as forged or Heretical, and in ſo doing, I ſhould muſter an Army of the moſt Eminent Doctors of the *Roman* Church, with two or three Popes in the Head of them, *viz.* *Pius* the IV. by whoſe Authority was compiled the *Expurgatory Index*, in which this Book was firſt forbid; *Sixtus* V. who Inlarged the *Roman* Index, and *Clement* the VIII. by whoſe order it was Reviſed and publiſhed. They are all competent

3. *Conc. Trid. Ibid. can.* 8. & *cap.* 8.

Wit-

Witneſſes that his Doctrine is not agreeable to the preſent Faith of the *Roman* Church. And our Authors * kind *Doway* Friends, are forced to Exerciſe their Wits for ſome handſome invention to make him a Roman-Catholick, and at laſt they cannot bring him fairly off, but are forced to change his words directly to a contrary ſenſe, and inſtead of *viſibly* write *inviſibly*, and *according to the ſubſtance of the Creatures*, muſt be interpreted *according to the outward ſpecies or accidents* of the Sacrament, *&c.* Which is not to explain an Author, but to corrupt him, and inſtead of interpreting his words, to put their own words into his Mouth. And after all, they acknowledge that there are ſome other things, which it were not either amiſs or imprudent wholly to expunge, in regard the loſs of thoſe paſſages will not ſpoil the ſenſe, nor will they be eaſily miſſed.

But I ſhall not build altogether upon their confeſſions, in regard others who have the ingenuity to acknowledge the Author Orthodox, and the

* *Vide Indic. Belgic. in Bertramo.* (*Excogitato commento.*)

work Catholick, have alſo the confidence to deny our claim to *Bertram*'s Authority, who is, as they pretend, though obſcure, yet their own. Therefore I ſhall ſhew in his own words, that his ſentiments in this matter are directly contrary to *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, and to the Council of *Trent* in three particulars.

1. He aſſerts that what is orally received, is not the true and natural Body of Chriſt.

2. He aſſerts that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine remain after Conſecration.

3. That what is orally received feeds the body, and that Chriſt is eaten *Spiritually*, and not *Orally*.

1. It is very plain from the determination of the ſecond Queſtion, that *Bertram* expreſly contradicts *Paſchaſius*, for the words of the Queſtion, are taken out of his book, and *Bertram* denies flatly what *Paſchaſius* affirms, *viz*. *That in the Sacrament we receive the ſame Body of Chriſt, which was born of the Virgin, Crucified, and roſe again.* He urges a multitude of Authorities out of the Fathers to confirm his own judgment herein,

herein, and in ſhort, but pithy expoſitions, ſheweth how they are pertinent to the buſineſs. In obviating an objection from the Teſtimony of St. *Ambroſe*, he tells us, *That the ſenſible object is Chriſts body and blood, not* in nature or kind, *but* virtually. He obſerves that St. *Ambroſe* diſtinguiſheth between the *Sacrament of Chriſts Fleſh*, and the *Verity of Chriſts Fleſh*, affirming *the latter to be that Fleſh which was born of the Virgin, and the Holy Euchariſt to be the Sacrament of that true Fleſh in which he was Crucified*, myſtically *repreſenting the former*. Again upon an objection, that St. *Ambroſe* calls it the body of Chriſt, he anſwers, *That it is the body and blood of Chriſt, not corporally, but Spiritually*. He ſhews that what is orally received in the Sacrament is not Chriſt's *Natural body*, *becauſe Chriſts natural body is incorruptible, whereas that which we receive in the Holy Euchariſt, is corruptible, viſible and to be felt*. He farther proves a great difference between Chriſts Natural and Sacramental Body and Blood in this, *that his Natural Body really was what it appeared to our ſenſes*, whereas the Euchariſt is one thing

in nature and appearance, and another thing in *ſignification*. Likewiſe expounding St. *Hieroms* Teſtimony, he ſaith, *Chriſts natural body had all the organical parts of an humane body, and was quickened with a reaſonable ſoul, whereas his body in the Sacrament hath neither*. He makes the body of Chriſt in the Sacrament to be *only an Image or Pledge*, but the Natural body of Chriſt *to be the Truth ſignified*. And in the firſt part he proves that the words of Chriſt Inſtituting this Sacrament are *Figurative*, and that the thing orally received, or the *Symbols had the name of the things ſignified thereby, it being uſual to give Signs or Sacraments the name of the very thing repreſented under them*. And this he proves from St. *Auguſtine*. It muſt be acknowledged, that *Bertram* ſometimes ſaith, *that it is truly Chriſts body and blood*; but mark how he explains himſelf, he ſaith, they are not ſo *as to their viſible nature*, but *by the power of the Divine Word, i. e.* not corporally, but ſpiritually: And he adds, the *viſible creature feeds the body, but the virtue and efficacy of the Divine Word, feeds and ſanctifies the ſoul of the Faithful*. So that when he affirms

the

the Sacrament to be truly Chriſts body, he means *truly* in oppoſition to *falſhood*, not *truly* as that word is oppoſed to *Figuratively*.

But *F. Mabillon*, and *F. Alexander*, make *Bertram* and *Paſchaſius* to ſay the ſame thing, and tell us that the former doth not deny the Truth of Chriſts natural body in the Sacrament, which he as well as *Paſchaſius* holds, but only that it is there *propria ſpecie*, i. e. *in its proper ſhape*, and *viſible form*, or *in its natural exiſtence*; I muſt now requite the candour of *F. Mabillon* to Archbiſhop *Uſher*, and impute this Opinion of his, to the prejudice of Education. For its very evident, that what *Ratramnus* labours to prove, is an *eſſential difference* between the Sacrament received by the Faithful and Chriſts body, as great a difference, as between a *body* and a *ſpirit*, between a corruptible and an incorruptible thing, between the *Image* and the Original *Truth*, between *Figure* and *Verity*: And it is as plain, that he admits theſe ſenſible qualities to be clear proofs of an eſſential difference, and alſo allows our outward ſenſes to be proper Judges in the caſe, appealing

to

to our eyes, our taſte and ſmell, * *as our Saviour did to the outward ſenſes, to prove the Verity of his body after his Reſurrection.* Behold, *my hands and my feet*, that it is I my ſelf; *Handle me, and ſee, for a Spirit hath not FLESH and BONES as you SEE me to have.* So that in his Opinion we have the ſame evidence, that the Sacramental Elements after Conſecration are not Chriſts natural body in which he ſuffered, which the Diſciples had that the body in which he appeared to them after his Reſurrection, was the ſame body in which he was Crucified and buried.

2. *Ratramnus* contradicts the Council of *Trent*, in affirming the *ſubſtance of Bread and Wine to remain after Conſecration*, which thoſe Fathers deny, with an *Anathema* to all that affirm it.

He tells us, expounding a citation out of St. *Ambroſe*, *As to the ſubſtance of the Creatures, what they were before*

* Sect. 99. He ſhews that our Saviours body after its Reſurrection, was viſible and palpable, and cites *Luke* 24. 39. Compare this with what he ſaith, Sect. 72. where he ſheweth the difference between Chriſts Natural and Spiritual Body.

Con-

Conſecration, they remain after it. Bread and Wine they were before, and after Conſecration we ſee they continue beings of the ſame kind or nature.

F. Mabillon conceives *Ratramnus* to aſſert Tranſubſtantiation in uſing the words *turn*, *converſion*, and *that it is made Chriſts Body inviſibly by the powerful operation of the Holy Ghoſt.* That the Bread and Wine after Conſecration *are not what they were before*, That they are *truly by the Myſtery turned into the ſubſtance of his body and blood*, &c. which laſt is the moſt plauſible ſentence he quotes.

But I would fain know, whether when he denies it to be a *natural change*, and affirms it to be a *Spiritual*, and which is all one, an *inviſible change*, alſo, *that the ſubſtance of Wine is ſeen after Conſecration*, and that by *Conſecration the Wine is made the Sacrament of Chriſts blood*, that it is made Chriſts Blood *divini ſignificatione Myſterii*, by the *ſignification of the Divine Myſtery.* That there was in the Manna and Water a *ſpiritual power of the Word*, viz. Chriſt, which fed the Souls of the believing *Iſraelites.* That the Pſalmiſt teacheth us *both what the Fathers received in the Hea-*

Heavenly Manna, and what the Faithful ought to believe in the Myſtery of Chriſts body, in both certainly Chriſt is ſignified. And in expreſs terms, that as *he could before his Paſſion turn the Bread and Wine into his body which was to ſuffer*, &c. *So* [*before his Incarnation*] *in the Wilderneſs, he turned the Manna and Water into his body and blood.*

And that as the Bread is Chriſts body, ſo is it the body of the Faithful People, and that if the conſecrated Wine were corporally converted into Chriſts blood, the Water mixt with it muſt be corporally converted in the blood of the Faithful People. I ſay after all this, I would fain know whether it be poſſible to impoſe this ſenſe upon *Ratramnus.* I muſt more than half Tranſcribe the Book, ſhould I collect all Paſſages which confute *F. Mabillion*'s Notion of the change which *Ratramnus* owns.

His ſenſe is very clear to any man who ſhuts not his Eyes, where he enumerates the three ſeveral kinds of Phyſical or Natural Changes, and proves that the Sacramental Change which Conſecration makes is none of theſe.

theſe. * Not Generation, for no new being is produced. Not corruption, for the Bread and Wine are not deſtroyed but remain after Conſecration in truth of Nature what they were before; Not alteration, for the ſame ſenſible qualities ſtill appear: Wherefore ſince Conſecration makes a change, and it is not a Natural but a Spiritual change, he concludes it is wrought † Figuratively, or Myſtically, and *that there are not together in the Sacrament two different things, a Body and a Spirit, but that it is one and the ſame thing, which in one reſpect*, viz. Naturally, *is Bread and Wine, and in another reſpect*, viz. of its ſignification and efficacy, *is Chriſts Body and Blood.* Or as he ſaith preſently, *they are in their nature corporeal Creatures*, but *according to their virtue, or efficacy*, they are *Spiritually made Myſteries* of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. And this Spiritual virtue feeding the Soul, and miniſtring to it the ſuſtenance of Eternal Life, is that which *Bertram* means, when he ſaith, that it is *myſtically changed into the ſubſtance of his Body and Blood*, for he calls this virtue *Subſtantiam vitæ Æternæ*, and

* Sect. 12. 13, 14, 15.

† Sect. 16.

as

as he calls our ſpiritual nouriſhment *the Bread of Eternal Life*, and *the ſubſtance of Eternal Life*, ſo in the place cited by *F. Mabillon*, he uſeth the word *ſubſtance* in the ſame ſenſe, *viz. for food or ſuſtenance*, and he elſewhere calls it *the Bread of Chriſts Body*, and preſently after explaining himſelf, calls it *the Bread of Eternal Life* *.

If *F. Mabillon* had obſerved thoſe two excellent Rules for underſtanding the ſenſe of Old Authors which he quotes out of *Facundus*, *viz.* not to interpret them by the chink of words, but their intention and ſcope, and to explain dubious and obſcure paſſages by plain ones; He could not have concluded him to hold a carnal Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.

But we are not to wonder that the *Romaniſts* attempt to reconcile

* *Manifeſtum eſt de quo pane loquitur, de* pane (*videlicet*) Corporis Chriſti, *qui non ex eo quod vadit in corpus, ſed ex eo quod* panis ſit vitæ æternæ, &c. Sect. 68. He means by the *ſubſtance of Chriſts Body* in that place, what he here calls the *Bread of Chriſts Body*, and Sect. 83. Eſca *illa* Corporis Domini & Potus *ille* Sanguinis ejus, are terms equivalent to *Subſtantia* in the place cited by *F. Mabillon*.

Ber-

Bertram with Tranſubſtantiation, though he wrote expreſly againſt it; when we remember that † *Franc: a ſancta Clara* about 50 years ſince had the confidence to attempt the expounding the 39 Articles of our Church, ſo as to make them bear what he calls a Catholick ſenſe, though they are many of them levelled by the Compilers point blank againſt the Errors of the *Roman* Church.

3 To theſe I may add what by conſequence deſtroyeth *Tranſubſtantiation*, and Chriſts carnal Preſence in the Sacrament. I mean, he frequently affirms, *That what the mouth receiveth, feeds and nouriſheth the body, and that it is what Faith only receiveth, that nouriſheth the Soul, and affords the ſuſtenance of Eternal Life.* I know our Adverſaries tell us, *thoſe Accidents have as much nouriſhing virtue as other ſubſtances.* So the Authors of the *Belgick Index* * anſwer the *Berengarian* experiment of ſome who have lived only upon the Holy Sacrament. Sure they muſt be very

† *Ad calcem libri cui Titulus, Deus, Natura Gratia. Quarto Ludg.* 1634.

* *Index Expurg. Belg. in Bertramo.*

groſs

groſs Accidents, if they fill the belly. But what if the *Trent* Faith, that the Accidents of Bread and Wine remain, without their ſubſtances be built upon a miſtaken *Hypotheſis* in Philoſophy? What if there be no ſuch thing in Nature as pure Accidents? What if Colours, Taſts, and Scents, are nothing elſe but matter in different poſitions, lights or motions, and little parts of the ſubſtance it ſelf ſallying out of the body, and making impreſſions apon the Organs of Senſe? Which Hypotheſis is embraced by the moſt curious Philoſophers of our Age, who have exploded the former; what then becomes of the Species or Accidents imagined to ſubſiſt in the Air?

To cloſe this Digreſſion, I ſhall add * *Bellarmines* Illuſtration of a body under *ſpecies* not properly its own. He tells his Catechumen, Lots *Wife was turned into a Pillar of Salt, and yet the* ſpecies *and likeneſs of a Woman remained. She was no longer* Lots *Wife*,

* *Bell. explic. Doct. Chriſt. De Sanctiſſima Euchariſt.* Quicunque hanc ſtatuam videbat, ille ſpeciem figuramque uxoris Loth videbat, quæ tamen uxor Loth amplius non fuit, ſed Sal ſub ſpecie mulieris deliteſcens.

but

but Salt hid under the Species, *or outward form of a Woman.*—— Thus do Errours and Abſurdities multiply without end.

I have ſaid enough to ſhew, that *Bertram* expreſly contradicts the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; but I muſt add a word or two, in Anſwer to the Evaſions of the *Romaniſts*.

Cardinal *Perron* tells us, that the Adverſaries whom *Ratramnus* encounters, were the *Stercoraniſts*, a ſort of Hereticks, that roſe up in the IX Century; and (*a*) *Mauguin* followeth him, with divers others. They are ſaid to Believe that Chriſt's Body is corruptible, paſſible, and ſubject to Digeſtion and the Draught, and that the Accidents were Hypoſtatically united to Chriſt's Body.

But we read of no ſuch Errours, cenſured by any Council in that Age; we do not find any Perſon of that Time, branding any Body with that infamous hard Name. The Perſons whom ſome late Writers have

(*a*) *Uterque Stercoraniſtarum Hæreſin, quæ illo tempore orta eſt, confutavit, uterque Catholicam veritatem aſſeruit, ſed* Radbertus *Tranſubſtantiationis veritatem clarius expreſſit. Maug. Tom. 2. Diſſ. c. 17. p. 134.*

aaccuſed, as Authors of that Hereſie, *viz.* *Rabanus* Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, and *Heribaldus* Biſhop of *Auxerre*, lived and died with the repute of Learned, Orthodox, and Holy Men, and are not accuſed by any of their own Time of thoſe foul Doctrines. The firſt I can learn of the Name, is, that *Humbertus* Biſhop of *Sylva Candida* calls *Nicetas* Stercoraniſt. And *Algerus* likewiſe calls the Greeks ſo, for holding that the Sacrament broke an Eccleſiaſtical Faſt, which is nothing to the *Gallicane* Church, and the IX Century. If (*a*) Cardinal *Humbert* drew up *Berengarius* his Recantation, he was the *veriеſt Stercoraniſt* who called *Stercoraniſt* firſt; and Pope *Nicolaus* II. with the whole Council that impoſed that Abjuration upon him, were Stercoraniſts to ſome purpoſe; who taught him, (*b*) *That Chriſt's Body is truly and ſenſibly handled and broken by the Prieſts*

(*a*) *Vide Labbeum de ſcript. Eccleſ. Tom.* 1. *p.* 484.

(*b*) Of the Stircoraniſts, an Imaginary Sect, firſt diſcovered by Cardinal *Perron*; ſee Conferences between a Romiſh Prieſt, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of of *England*, p. 63. And Mr. *L'Arroque* in his Hiſt. of the Euchariſt, Book II. ch. 14.

Hands

Hands, and ground by the Teeth of the Faithful. And it is very unlikely that *Bertram* writ againſt ſuch an Hereſie, when admitting him to have been of the ſame Faith with the Church of *Rome*, touching Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament, he muſt have been a Stercoraniſt himſelf, who aſſerts, that what *the Mouth receives, is ground by the Teeth, ſwallowed down the Throat, and deſcends into the Belly, nouriſhing the Body like common Food.*

But (*a*) F. *Mabillon* waves this Pretence of the Stercoraniſts, and makes *Bertram* to have, through miſtake, oppoſed an Errour he thought *Haymo* guilty of, *viz. That the conſecrated Bread and Cup are not ſigns of Chriſt's Body and Blood.* I confeſs the words cited by him, I can ſcarce underſtand, but (if that piece of *Haymo* be genuine) by the citation he takes from him in the end of the ſame Paragraph, in which he aſſerts, *That though the Taſte and Figure of Bread and Wine remain, yet the nature of the Subſtance is wholly turned into Chriſt's Body and Blood*; I ſee no reaſon why *Bertram* might not write againſt *Paſchaſius* and *Haymo* too. Though in truth I

(*a*) *Mabillon. Præf. ad ſec. IV. p. 2. nu. 93.*

do not imagine him to have confuted the Book of *Paſchaſius*, but only his Notion in anſwer to the two Queſtions propounded to the King.

Who were the Adverſaries of *Paſchaſius* (whoſe Doctrine is owned to be the Catholick Faith now held by the *Roman* Church) he himſelf is beſt able to tell us, and he informs us, (a) *That they were ſuch as denied the Preſence of Chriſt's Fleſh in the Sacrament, but held an inviſible power and efficacy in and with the Elements, becauſe* (ſay they) *there is no Body but what is viſible and palpable*; which are the Sentiments of *Ratramnus*, as will evidently appear to any unbyaſs'd Reader.

But to deprive us of all pretence to the Authority of *Bertram*, they falſly impute to us the utter denial of the Verity of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament, which we deny no otherwiſe than *Bertram* doth. And to vindicate the Reformed Church of *England* in this point, I ſhall propound her Doctrine, out of her Liturgy, Articles and Catechiſm.

In the Catechiſm, we learn *That the Body and Blood of Chriſt are verily*

(a) *Paſchaſius in Epiſt. ad* Frudegardum.

and

and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.

In the 28 Article, we profeſs, *That to them who worthily receive the* Lord's Supper, *the Bread which we break, is the Communion of the Body of Chriſt; and likewiſe the Cup of Bleſſing, is the partaking of the Blood of Chriſt.*

In the Prayer before Conſecration, we beſeech God that we may ſo eat the *Fleſh of Chriſt, and drink his Blood,* that our ſinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls waſhed through his moſt precious Blood.

In the Conſecration Prayer, we deſire *to be made partakers of his moſt bleſſed Body and Blood.*

And in the Poſt-Communion, we give God thanks for vouchſafing *to feed us———with the ſpiritual food of Chriſt's moſt bleſſed Body and Blood.*

It is not the Verity of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament, that our Church denies, but the raſh and peremptory determination of the manner of his Preſence by the *Roman* Church. 'Tis a Corporal and Carnal Preſence, and Tranſubſtantiation, which we deny.

This our Church declares againſt in the Rubrick about Kneeling at the Communion, aſſerting that we Kneel not (*a*) *to adore any corporal Preſence of Chriſt's natural Fleſh and Blood.* That *the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain in their very natural Subſtances after Conſecration.* Alſo, that *the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Chriſt are in Heaven, and not here, it being againſt the truth of Chriſt's natural Body, to be at one time in more places than one.* Our (*b*) Church declares, that *Tranſubſtantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occaſion to many Superſtitions. That Chriſt's Body is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only in an Heavenly and Spiritual manner; And that the means whereby the Body of Chriſt is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith only.* Theſe are Authentick Teſtimonies of the Doctrine of our Church, out of her publick Acts. I might add others of very great Authority, out of the Apology for our Church, written by the Learned *Jewel*,

(*a*) At the end of the Communion Service.
(*b*) *Art.* 28.

toge-

together with its Defence by the Author, Biſhop (a) *Andrews* againſt *Bellarmine*, the Teſtimony of King *James* in (b) *Caſaubon*'s Epiſtle to Cardinal *Perron*, (c) *Hooker*, Biſhop (d) *Montague* againſt *Bulengerus*, *&c.* but for brevity's ſake, I refer the Reader to the Books themſelves. And alſo for a Vindication of the Forreign Reformed Churches in this matter, I deſire the Reader to conſult their Confeſſions, and the Citations collected by Biſhop (e) *Coſins*, out of their Confeſſions, and their moſt Eminent Writers.

Both we and they aſſert the Verity of Chriſt's Body and Blood, as far as the nature of a Sacrament will admit, or is neceſſary to anſwer the ends for which that Holy Myſtery was inſtituted by our Saviour. We own a real communication of Chriſt's Body and Blood, in that way which the Soul is only capable of receiving it, and benefit by it. We acknow-

(a) *Elienſis Apolog. contra Bellarm. p.* 11.
(b) *Caſaubonus nomine* Jacobi *Regis in Epiſtola ad Card. Perronum, p.* 48. *&* 51. *ubi exſcribit verba Elienſis.* (c) *Hooker Eccleſ. Policy, lib.* 5. *ſect.*67. (d) *Montacutius in Antidiatrib. contra Bulenger. p.* 143. (e) *Hiſt Tranſub. c.* 2.

ledge the Verity of Chriſt's Body, in the ſame ſence that *Bertram* doth; and deny the ſame Errors, which the Church of *Rome* hath ſince impoſed upon all of her Communion for Articles of Faith, which *Bertram* rejected; though ſince that time they are encreaſed in bulk, and formed into a more Artificial Syſteme. Moſt, if not all of theſe determinations of our Church are to be found in this little Book, if not in expreſs terms, yet in ſuch expreſſions as neceſſarily import them. And perhaps the judgment of *Bertram* was more weighed by our Reformers in this Point, than any of our Neighbour Churches. Biſhop (*a*) *Ridley*, who had a great hand in compiling the Liturgy and Articles, in King *Edward* VI. his Reign, had ſuch an eſteem of this Author and Work, *that he doth in his Paper given in to Queen* Maries *Commiſſioners at* Oxford, *beſides his own Anſwers and Confirmations, inſiſt upon whatever* Bertram *wrote on this Argument, as a further proof of his Doctrine, profeſſing that he doth not ſee, how any Godly Man can gain-ſay his Arguments, and that it was*

(*a*) *In Præf. libri de Cœna Domini Latinè excuſi Genev.* 1556.

this

this Book that put him firſt upon examining the old Opinion, concerning the Preſence of Chriſt's very Fleſh and Blood in the Sacrament, by the Scriptures and Elder Fathers of the Church, and converted him from the Errours of the Church of Rome *in that point.* And Dr.(*a*) *Burnet* tells us the ſame, adding, *That* Ridley *having read* Bertram, *and concluding Tranſubſtantiation to be none of the Ancient Doctrines of the Church, but lately brought in, and not fully received till after* Bertram's *Age, communicated the matter with* Cranmer, *and they ſet themſelves to examine it with more than ordinary care.* Thus he, in the account he gives of the Diſputation concerning the Real Preſence, *A. D.* 1549. which is the year in which the firſt Common-Prayer-Book of King *Edward* VI. was publiſhed; at which time alſo *Bertram* was Printed in Engliſh, by order of Biſhop *Ridley*. So that a Reverend and Learned Divine of our Church, (*b*) had reaſon, in aſſerting the Doctrine of *Bertram* was the very ſame Doctrine which

(*a*) Dr. *Burnet*'s Hiſt. of the Reform. p. II. Book I. p 107.

(*a*) Several Conferences between a Popiſh Prieſt, &c. p. 61.

the

the Church of *England* embraced, as moſt conſonant to Scripture and the Fathers. Which is not what our Adverſaries would put upon us, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a naked Commemoration of our Saviour's Death, and a meer Sign of his Body and Blood, but an efficacious Myſtery, accompanied with ſuch a Divine and Spiritual Power, as renders the conſecrated Elements truly, tho' Myſtically, Chriſt's Body and Blood, and communicates to us the real Fruits, and ſaving Benefits of his bitter Paſſion. And this is the Doctrine of *Bertram*, in both parts of this Work.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

That Ratramnus *was not ſingular in his Opinion, but had ſeveral other Great Men in his own and the following Age, of the ſame Judgment with him in this Point.*

BUt after all that I have ſaid, if *Ratramnus* (tho' never ſo Learned or Orthodox) were ſingular in his Sentiments touching Chriſt's Preſence in the holy Euchariſt, we can make little of his Authority. If the general Belief of the Church in his Time, were contrary, it only ſheweth, that one Eminent Divine had ſome Heterodox Opinions. Let us therefore examine the Writers of his own Age and the next after him, and ſee whether he or *Paſchaſius* delivered the current Sence of the Church.

I ſhall not ſtand to examine the Belief of the more Ancient and Pure Times of Chriſtianity, but refer my

my Reader to *Albertinus*, Archbiſhop *Uſher*, and Biſhop *Coſins* for an account of it. I ſhall confine myſelf to the IX and X Centuries; in which we ſhall find ſeveral of the moſt Eminent Doctors and Writers of the Church of the ſame Judgment with *Ratramnus*, and ſome who were offended at the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius*.

And indeed there are manifeſt Tokens in his Book, but more evident Proofs in his Epiſtle to *Frudegardus*, that his Doctrine did not paſs without contradiction in his own life time. When he delivers his Paradox, he prepares his Reader for ſome wondrous Doctrine. And ſo ſtrange was that new Doctrine of his, that (if the (*a*) Anonymous Writer publiſhed by F. *Mabillon* be *Rabanus* his Epiſtle to *Egilo*) this Great and Learned Biſhop profeſſeth, *That he never heard or read it before, and he much wondred that St.* Ambroſe *ſhould be quoted for it, and more, that* Paſchaſius *ſhould aſſert it.* But F. *Mabillon* offers it only by way of conjecture, modeſtly ſubmitting it to the Judgment of Learned Men, whether that Tract againſt *Radbertus*

(*a*) *Anonym. de Euch. ad finem Sec IV. p.2.*

be

be the Epiſtle of *Rabanus* or not. And I conceive there are better reaſons to perſwade us, that it is not, than thoſe he offers to prove, that it is. As that it bears not the Name of *Rabanus*, though himſelf mention his writing on that Subject to *Egilo*. That it is not in an Epiſtolary Form, *Egilo* is not ſo much as named, nor doth any addreſs to a ſecond perſon appear throughout it, but it is plainly a Polemical piece. To which I may add, that in the Anonymous piece there occurs an odd diſtinction of the ſame Body *Naturaliter*, and *Specialiter*, and yet in expounding the Doctrine of the Sacrament to *Heribaldus*, it is not uſed by *Rabanus*, though that Epiſtle to *Egilo* were firſt written. But whoever he were that wrote it, he was in all likelyhood an Author of the ſame Time, and treats *Paſchaſius* very courſly and ſeverely, It is not likely that it was written while he was Abbot, ſince the Author flouts him, and in an Ironical way, calls him *Pontificem*.

Among the Writers of the IX Century, I ſhall number (a) *Charles the*

(a) *Inter ſcriptores de Divinis Officiis Ed. per Hittorpium Par.* 1610. *col.* 303.

Great,

Great, though perhaps the Epiſtle to *Alcuin* was written ſomewhat before, wherein he affirms, that Chriſt ſupping with his Diſciples, brake Bread, and gave it *them with the Cup for a FIGURE of his Body and Blood, and exhibited a Sacrament highly advantagious to us.* As Venerable *Bede* before him ſpeaks, *He gave in the Supper to his Diſciples, a FIGURE of his Holy Body and Blood*, which notion conſiſts not with the carnal Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament.

(*a*) *Theodulphus Aurelianenſis*, near the beginning of this Century, ſaith, that *by the viſible offering of the Prieſt, and the inviſible conſecration of the Holy Ghoſt, Bread and Wine paſs into the Dignity* [not the Subſtance] *of the Body and Blood of our Lord.*— *As Jeſus Chriſt is figured by the Wine, ſo are the Faithful People by Water.*

Amalarius (*b*) *Fortunatus*, in the Preface of his Books of Divine Offices, makes the Sacramental Bread and Wine to repreſent the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and the Oblation

(*a*) *Apud L'Arroque Hiſt. Euch. l.* 2. *c.* 13.
(*b*) *Amalarius Fortunatus Ibidem In Præfat. Col.* 307. *& l.* 1. *c.* 24.

to

to reſemble Chriſt's own offering of himſelf on the Croſs, as the Prieſt doth the Perſon of Chriſt. And elſewhere he ſaith, *that* the Sacraments of Chriſt's Body are, *ſecundum quendum modum* after ſome ſort Chriſt's Body, which is like *Bertram*'s *ſecundum quid*, not abſolutely and properly, but in ſome reſpect the Body of Chriſt: and *Amalarius* cites that Paſſage of St. *Auguſtine* which *Bertram* alledged, to render a reaſon why the Sacramental Signs have the name of the Thing ſignified.

What the Doctrine of *Joannes Scotus* was, is hard to ſay, only in the general 'tis agreed, that it was contrary to that of *Paſchaſius*, though perhaps he erred on the other extreme, making it a naked, empty Figure or Memory of our Saviour's Death.

And though (*a*) *Florus*, Deacon of the Church of *Lyons*, accord not with *Scotus* in his Sentiments touching Predeſtination, yet he agrees with him in contradicting the carnal Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament; for in his

(*a*) *Bib. Patrum, Tom.* 6. *Par.* 1610. *Col.* 226, 227.

Expo-

Expoſition of the Maſs, he ſaith, *That when the Creature of Bread and Wine is by the ineffable ſanctification of the Spirit tranſlated into the SACRAMENT of Chriſt's Body, Chriſt is eaten. That he is eaten by parts in the Sacrament, and remains whole in Heaven, and in the Faithful Receiver's heart.* And again, *All that is done in the Oblation of the Lord's Body and Blood, is a Myſtery; there is one thing ſeen, and another underſtood; that which is ſeen, hath a Corporal nature; that which is underſtood, hath a Spiritual fruit.*

And in the Manuſcript (*a*) Homilies, which F. *Mabillon* concludes are his, expounding the words of our Saviour inſtituting the Sacrament, he ſaith commenting on, This is my Body: *the Body that ſpake was one thing, the Body which was given was another. The Body which ſpake was ſubſtantial, that Body which was given was Myſtical; for the Body of our Lord died, was buried, roſe again and aſcended into heaven, but that Body which was delivered to the Apoſtles in the Sacrament, is daily conſecrated by the Prieſts hands.*

(*a*) *In Homiliario MS. Eccleſ. Lugd. apud Mabillon A. B. Sec. IV. Par. 2. Præfat. nu.* 80.

* *Wala-*

* *Walafridus Strabo*, in the ſame Century teacheth, *That Chriſt in his laſt Supper with his Diſciples juſt before he was betrayed, after the Solemnity of the Ancient Paſſeover, delivered the Sacraments of his own Body and Blood to his Diſciples in the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine.*

† *Chriſtian Druthmarus* a Monk of *Corbey*, and contemporary both with *Bertram* and *Paſchaſius*, in his Comment on St. *Matthew*, expounding the words of Inſtitution, ſaith, *That Chriſt gave his Diſciples the Sacrament of his Body—— to the end that being mindful of this Action, they ſhould always do this in a Figure, and not forget what he was about to do for them. This is my Body*, that is, *Sacramentally*, or *in a Sacrament or Sign:* And a little before he ſaith, *Chriſt did Spiritually change Bread into his Body, and Wine into his Blood*, which is the Phraſe of *Bertram* a Monk in the ſame Cloyſter with him.

To theſe may be added * *Ahyto* Bi-

* *Apud Hittorpium. De rebus Eccleſ. c. 16.*

† *Apud Albertinum de Euchar. lib. 2. pag. 934. Hoc eſt corpus meum id eſt* in Sacramento.

* *Apud L'Arroque in Hiſt. Euchar. lib. 2. c. 13. ex Dacherii Spicileg. Tom. 6.*

ſhop of *Baſil*, in the beginning of this Century, whoſe words cited by Mr. *L'Arroque* in his Hiſtory of the Euchariſt are theſe—— *The Prieſt ought to know what the Sacrament of Baptiſm and Confirmation is, and what the Myſtery of the Body and Blood of the Lord is, how a viſible Creature is ſeen in thoſe Myſteries, and nevertheleſs inviſible Salvation, or Grace, is thereby communicated for the ſalvation of the Soul, the which is contained in Faith only.* Mr. *L'Arroque* well obſerves, that his words relate to Baptiſm and Confirmation as well as the Lord's Supper; he diſtinguiſheth in both the ſign from the thing ſignified, and aſſerts alike, in all three, that there is a viſible Creature, communicating Inviſible, or Spiritual Grace, which is received by Faith only.

Moreover, the Queſtion moved by *Heribaldus* to *Rabanus*, which he anſwers (and upon that ſcore both thoſe Learned and Holy Biſhops have been traduced as Stercoraniſts) evidently ſhews the Sentiments of *Heribaldus* to have been contrary to thoſe of *Paſchaſius* on this Argument. For he

he never could have moved the Queſtion if he had not believed the external part of the Sacrament to be corporal Food, as *Ratramnus* doth.

The Judgment of *Rabanus*, Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, whom *Baronius* ſtiles *the brighteſt Star of Germany*, and as *Trithemius* ſays, *who had not his fellow in* Italy *or* Germany, agrees with that of *Ratramnus*, and appears in ſeveral of his writings. He teacheth, * *That our Lord choſe to have the Sacraments of his Body and Blood received by the mouth of the Faithful, and reduced to Nouriſhment, on purpoſe that by the viſible Body the Spiritual effect might be ſhewn. For as Material food outwardly nouriſheth, and gives vigor to the body, ſo doth the Word of God inwardly nouriſh and ſtrengthen the Soul.* Again, *The Sacrament is one thing, and the virtue of the Sacrament is another, for the Sacrament is received with the mouth, but the inner man is fed with*

* *Raban. de inſtitut. Cleric. lib.* 1. *c.* 31.

the virtue of the Sacrament. In his † Penitential, he makes the Sacrament ſubject to all the affections of common food, and tells of *ſome of late*, viz. *Paſchaſius* and his followers, *who had entertained falſe Sentiments touching the Sacrament of the Lords Body and Blood, ſaying, That this very Body of our Lord which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *in which our Lord ſuffered on the Croſs, and roſe again from the Grave,* [is the ſame which we receive from the Altar] *againſt which error writing to* Egilus *the Abbot, we have according to our ability, declared what we are truly to believe concerning the Lords very Body.*

From which Paſſage many things of moment may be collected.

1. That *Paſchaſius* was written againſt in his life-time, and not long after his propounding his Doctrine publickly, by ſending his Book, together with an Epiſtle, to *Carolus Calvus.*

† *Ad Calcem Reginon. Prum. editi per Baluzium habetur Epiſtola hæc Rabani, unde Heribaldum vide c.* 33.

Quidam nuper de ipſo Sacramento corporis & ſanguinis Domini non rite ſentientes, dixerunt hoc ipſum Corpus & Sanguinem Domini quod de Maria Virgine natum eſt, & in quo ipſe Dominus paſſus eſt in cruce, & reſurrexit de Sepulchro [*idem eſſe quod ſumitur de Altari*] *cui Errori*, &c.

For

For *Rabanus* died before *Paſchaſius*, and * *Baluzius* makes it out very well, that he wrote this Anſwer to the Queries of *Heribaldus*, *A. D.* 853. In which year *Egilus* mentioned by him was made Abbot of *Promie*, and the queſtion of the validity of Orders conferred by *Ebbo* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, after his Depoſition, was diſcuſſed in the Synod at *Soiſſons*.

2. We learn from this Paſſage, that *Rabanus* judged the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius* to be a Novel Error, which he would not have done, had there been any colour of Antient Tradition or Authority for it.

3. That *F. Cellot* is miſtaken, in charging his Anonymous Writer with ſlandering *Rabanus*, as alſo in ſaying, that what *Rabanus* wrote on this Argument, he wrote in his youth, falſly preſuming that *Egilus*, to whom he wrote, was Abbot of *Fulda*, and immediate Predeceſſor to *Rabanus* in the Government of that Monaſtry, where as it was another *Egilus* made Abbot of *Promie*, *A. D.* 853. when *Rabanus* was very old, and but three years before his death.

4. Theſe words [*the ſame which is*

* *In præfat. ad Rabani Epiſt. n.* 17.

received from the Altar] were as * Baluzius *and* F. Mabillon *obſerve*, razed out of the *MS*, from whence *Stevartius* publiſhed that Epiſtle of *Rabanus*. Which I take notice of, becauſe Mr. *Arnauds Modeſt Monk of St. Genouefe*, makes ſo much difficulty to believe Arch-biſhop *Uſher*, who tells of a Paſſage of the ſame importance razed out of an old *MS*. Book of *Penitential* Canons in *Bennet* Colledg Library in *Cambridge*, though he had ſeen it himſelf, and no doubt the other *MS*. alſo out of which the loſt paſſage was reſtored.

This Paſſage is an Authority of the X Century confirming † *Bertram*'s Doctrine, which I ſhall Tranſcribe. *(But this Sacrifice is not the Body in which he ſuffered for us, nor his Blood which he ſhed for us, but it is Spiritually made his Body and Blood like the Manna rained down from Heaven, and the Water which Flowed from the Rock, as)* &c. Theſe words incloſed between two half Circles, ſome had raſed out of *Worceſter* book, but they are reſtored again out of a book of *Exeter*

* *Baluz. in notis ad c.* 33. *Ad calcem Reginonis.*

† At the end of the *Saxon* Homily Printed by *Jo. Day.*

Church

Church, as is noted in the Margin by the firſt Publiſhers of this Epiſtle, and the Saxon Homily, they are both one Authors work, *viz.* *Elfric*'s. Thus the Reader may be ſatisfied how the Paſſage was recovered. And Biſhop *Uſher* did not invent it, which had it been loſt utterly, might alſo have been reſtored out of the Saxon Epiſtle printed immediately before it. And now I am ſpeaking of ſuch deteſtable practices, I cannot but add what for the ſake of ſuch a Paſſage hath befallen St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Epiſtle to *Cæſarius*. The Paſſage runs thus, * *As before the Bread is Conſecrated we call it* BREAD, *but after the Divine Grace hath conſecrated it by the Miniſtry of the Prieſt, it is freed from* THE NAME OF BREAD, *and honoured with* THE NAME OF THE LORDS BODY, *though the* NATURE OF BREAD *remaineth in it, and we do not teach two Bodies,*

* *Sicut enim antequam Sanctificetur Panis, Panem nominamus, Divina autem illum ſanctificante gratia, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus eſt quidem appellatione panis; dignus autem habitus eſt Dominici Corporis appellatione, etiamſi natura Panis in ipſo permanſit, & non duo corpora, ſed unum corpus Filii prædicamus ſic, &c.* Apud Steph. Le Moine inter Varia Sacra. *Tom.* 1. *p.* 532.

but one Body of the Son, ſo &c. This Epiſtle *Peter Martyr* found in the *Florentine* Library, and Tranſcribed ſeveral Copies of it, one of which he gave to Arch-biſhop *Cranmer*, the Copies of this Epiſtle being loſt, the World was perſuaded by the Papiſts, that the Paſſage was a Forgery committed by *Peter Martyr*. This paſt current for about a 100 years, till at laſt *Emericus Bigotius* found it, and Printed the whole Epiſtle with * the Life of St. *Chryſoſtom*, and ſome other little things, but when it was Finiſht, this † Epiſtle was taken out of the Book, and not ſuffered to ſee Light.

The place out of which this Epiſtle was expunged, is viſible in the Book by a break in the Signature at the bottom, and the numbers at the top of the Page. But at length it is publiſhed by Mr. *le Moine* among ſeveral other Ancient pieces at *Leyden*, 1685. And ſince more accurately, in the Appendix to the *Defence of the*

* *Palladii vita Chryſoſtomi Gr. lat. &c. Quarto. Par.* 1680. *Inter paginas* 235. & 245. *In Schedis ſignatis G. g. & H. h.*

† *Vide Expoſtulationem hac de re editam, in Quarto. Londini.* 1682.

Ex-

Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of England.

So that notwithſtanding the *French* Monks indignation at the Learned *Uſher* for charging the Papiſts with the razure of an old *MS.* its plain, that ſuch tricks are not unuſual with them, that they are more ancient than their publick *Expurgatory Indices*, and more miſchievous, and that ſome of their great Doctors at this day make no conſcience of ſtifling antient Teſtimonies againſt their corruptions, when it lies in their power.

I ſhall trouble the Reader with no more Citations to prove the concurrence of other Doctors of the Ninth and Tenth Century with *Ratramnus*, in his Sentiments touching Chriſt's Preſence in the Holy Sacrament. Theſe are enough to ſhew that his opinion was neither ſingular, nor novel, and that though he be the fulleſt and moſt expreſs witneſs of the Faith of thoſe times, yet he is not a ſingle Evidence, but is ſupported by the Teſtimonies of many of the beſt Writers of thoſe times. And his Doctrine is reproved by no body, but *Paſchaſius*, who reflects a little upon

upon it in his Epiſtle to *Frudegardus*, and that piece of his commentary on *Matthew* that is annext to it.

On the contrary, the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius* was impugned as Novel and Erroneous by the Anonymous Writer publiſhed by F. *Mabillon*, by *Rabanus*, and *Ratramnus*, neither doth it in all things pleaſe his Anonymous Friend ſaid to be *Herigerus*, who writes in his favour, and collects paſſages out of the Ancients to excuſe the *ſimplicity* of *Paſchaſius*. His own writings ſhew, that he valued himſelf upon ſome new diſcovery, *which excited many to a more perfect underſtanding of that great Myſtery*. That his Paradox was in danger of paſſing for a *Dream*, or * *Poetical fiction*, and that when he wrote to *Frudegardus*, many *doubted the truth* of his Doctrine. *Frudegardus* once his Proſelite upon reading a Paſſage in St. † *Auguſtine*, which *Bertram* alſo cites, was diſſatisfied with his Explication of Chriſts Preſence, and whether this Epiſtle did effectually eſtabliſh him, in the

* *In Epiſtolis hortatur Placidum, & Regem Carolum ne exiſtiment illum* contexere fabulam de falſura Maronis.

† *Auguſtin. de Doct. Chriſt. l.* 3. *c.* 16.

belief

belief of *Radberts* Doctrine, or whether he adhered to St. *Auguſtine*, cannot now be known.

It is evident, notwithſtanding ſome groſs conceipts which began to poſſeſs the minds of men in thoſe dark and barbarous Ages, that the Church had not as yet received the Popiſh Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which was left by *Paſchaſius* its Damme, a rude Lump, which required much Licking, to reduce it into any tolerable ſhape or form, as a * Reverend Author obſerves, and was not confirmed by the Authority of any Pope or Council in 200 Years after, nor did the Monſter receive its name till the Fourth *Lateran* Council.

The Writers of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, ſpeak of a *change*, or *converſion* of the Elements into Chriſt's Body; but it is plain they mean not a Natural, but a Myſtical or Sacramental change, ſuch as happens upon the † *Chriſtening of a Pagan*; they affirm the Elements to be Chriſts Body and Blood after Conſecration,

* The B. of St. *Aſaph* in a Sermon before the late King, 1678.

† See the Saxon Homily.

in

in the ſence of * St. *Auguſtine*, *not in Truth of Nature, but by Myſtical ſignification:* And, according to the Doctrine of that Father, teach †, that *in the Sacraments we are not to mind the nature of the viſible Object, but its ſignification; in regard Sacraments are Signs which A R E one thing, and S I G N I F I E another.*

They all, according to the Language of St. *Paul*, ſtile the Conſecrated Elements Bread and Wine, our *Saxon* * Homiliſt ſaith, *this Bread is my Body*, and † *Bertram* in the place where F. *Mabillon* thinks the adding of *exiſtit* is of ſome moment, ſaith, *Bread and Wine* is Chriſt's Body and Blood. They make the Sacrament to be a *Figure*, they ſpeak of a converſion of the Elements into the *Sacraments* of Chriſt's Body and Blood, they diſtinguiſh between Chriſt's *natural* Body and his *myſtical* Body, the Body *which ſpake*, and the Body *which*

---

* *Non rei veritate, ſed ſignificante myſterio. S. Aug. apud Gratianum de Conſecr. Diſt. 2. c. 48. Hoc eſt Sect. Sicut.*

† *Aug. contra Maxim. l. 3. c. 22.*

* *Fol. 28.*

† *Sect. 99.* Panis & Calix *qui Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti nominatur & exiſtit.*

was

was given to his Diſciples, and deny that the nature of the Elements is altered by Conſecration, which if any man can reconcile with Tranſubſtantiation, I ſhall acknowledge that Miracles are not ceaſed in the Roman Church.

R A-

RATRAMNI

Presbyteri & Monachi Corbeiensis;

(*qui vulgo BERTRAMUS nuncupatur*)

LIBER

De Corpore & Sanguine Domini.

The Book of

RATRAMNUS

Prieſt and Monk of *Corbey*;

(Commonly called

BERTRAM)

Touching the

BODY and BLOOD of the LORD.

Sigebertus Gemblacenſis in libro de Viris Illuſtribus. c. 96.

BErtramus (a) *Scripſit librum de Corpore & Sanguine Domini & ad* (b) Carolum *librum de Prædeſtinatione.*

Teſtimonium Joannis Trithemii in Libro de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis.

BErtramus *Presbyter & Monachus, in divinis Scripturis valde peritus, & in literis Sæcularium Diſciplinarum egregie doctus: Ingenio ſubtilis & clarus Eloquio; nec minus vita quam doctrina inſignis; ſcripſit multa præclara opuſcula, de quibus ad meam notitiam pauca pervenerunt. Ad* Carolum *Regem* Lotharii *Imperatoris Fratrem ſcripſit commendabile opus.*

De Prædeſtinatione (c) *lib.* 1.

De Corpore & Sanguine Domini lib. 1.

Claruit temporibus Lotharii *Imperatoris Anno Domini DCCCXL.*

(a) *In Gemblac. cod. erat* Ratramus *& in Cod. Virid Vallis.*

(b) Calvum.

(c) *Scripſit de Prædeſtinatione libros duos.*

Sige-

Sigebert Gemblacenſis in his Book of Illuſtrious Men, *Chap.* 96.

BErtram * wrote a Book of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and a Book of Predeſtination, to *Charles*, *viz. the Bald.*

The Teſtimony of *John Trithemius*, in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

BErtram, a Prieſt and Monk, a very able Divine, and alſo well skilled in Humane Learning; a Perſon of a ſubtile Wit and great Eloquence: and no leſs eminent for Sanctity than Learning, hath written many excellent Pieces, few of which have come to my knowledge. To K. *Charles*, Brother to *Lotharius* the Emperor, he wrote a commendable Work.

Of Prediſtination *a* one Book.

Of the Lords Body and Blood one Book.

He flouriſhed in the Reign of *Lotharius* the Emperour, *A. D.* 840.

---

* Two MSS. of *Sigebert* call him *Ratramus*.

a He wrote two Books of Predeſtination.

[a] INCIPIT LIBER RATRAMNI DE CORPORE ET SANGUINE DOMINI.

[[b] AD CAROLUM [c] MAGNUM [d] IMPERATOREM.]

PRÆFATIO.

I. *Jussistis* [e], *Glorioſe Princeps, ut quid de Sanguinis & Corporis Chriſti Myſterio ſentiam, veſtræ Magnificentiæ ſignificem. Imperium quam magnifico veſtro Principatu dignum, tam noſtræ Parvitatis viribus conſtat difficilimum. Quid enim dignius Regali Providentia, quam de illius ſacris Myſteriis Catholice ſapere, qui ſibi Regale ſo-*

a *Ita ſe habet MS. Laubienſis. Apud Mabillon. Act. Bened. Secul. 4. par. 2. Præf. c. 1. n.* 83. & 129.

b *Hæc Inſcriptio non eſt Autoris, nec exſtat in MS. Laub. MS. Salem. legit Ad Carolum magnum.*

c Calvum *Magni Nepotem.*

d Regem

e *Juſſiſtis* ex MS. Laub. in impreſſis *Jubes. item in MS. Monaſterii Salem.*

lium

Here begins the Book of

RATRAMNUS

Concerning the

BODY and BLOOD of the LORD.

[To *CHARLES the Great* EMPEROUR.]

The Preface.

I. YOU were pleaſed to command me Glorious Prince, to ſignifie to your Majeſty my Sentiments touching the Myſtery of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. Which Command is no leſs becoming your Highneſs, than the Performance of it is above my poor Abilities. For what can better deſerve a Princes Care, than to ſee that he himſelf be Catholick in his Judgment, concerning the Sacred Myſteries of that God, who has placed him on the Royal Throne, and not able to endure,

lium dignatus eſt contribuere, & ſubjectos pati non poſſe diverſa ſentire de Corpore Chriſti, in quo conſtat Chriſtianæ redemptionis ſummam conſiſtere ?

II. *Dum enim quidam fidelium Corporis Sanguiniſq; Chriſti* *, *quod in Eccleſia quotidie celebratur, dicant quod nulla ſub figura, nulla ſub obvelatione fiat, ſed ipſius veritatis nuda manifeſtatione peragatur ; quidam vero teſtentur, quod hæc ſub Myſterii figura contineantur, & aliud ſit quod corporeis ſenſibus appareat, aliud autem quod fides aſpiciat ; non parva diverſitas inter eos* † *dignoſcitur. Et cum Apoſtolus fidelibus ſcribat,* ut idem ſapiant & idem dicant omnes, & Schiſma nullum inter eos appareat, *non parvo Schiſmate dividuntur, qui de Myſterio Corporis, Sanguiniſque Chriſti non eadem ſentientes eloquuntur.*

III. *Quapropter veſtra Regalis Sublimitas zelo fidei provocata, non æquanimiter iſta perpendens, & ſecundum Apo-*

---

* Deeſt *Myſterium.*

† *Impreſſi Codd.* eſſe dinoſcitur *legunt.*

ſtoli

dure, that his Subjects ſhould hold different opinions concerning the Body of Chriſt, wherein it is evident, that the ſum of our Redemption by Chriſt conſiſts?

Great diſputes concerning the Preſence of Chriſts Body in the Sacrament.

II. For while ſome of the Faithful ſay concerning the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which is daily celebrated in the Church, that there is no Vail nor Figure, but that the very thing it ſelf is openly and really exhibited; and others of them affirm, that theſe things [*viz.* the Body, the Body and Blood of Chriſt] are preſent in a Myſtery or Figure; that it is one thing that appears to our bodily eyes, and another thing that our Faith beholds; it's plain, there is no ſmall difference in Judgment among them: And whereas the Apoſtle writes to the Faithful, * *That they ſhould all think, and ſpeak the ſame thing, and that there ſhould be no Schiſm among them*; there is no ſmall Diviſion and Schiſm among thoſe who believe and ſpeak differently concerning the Myſtery of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

III. Wherefore your Royal Highneſs mov'd with Zeal for the true Faith, and ſadly laying to heart theſe

* 1 Cor. 1. 10.

ſtoli præceptum cupiens, ut idem ſentiant & idem dicant omnes, *veritatis diligenter inquirit ſecretum, ut ad eam deviantes revocare poſſit. Unde non contemnitis, etiam ab* humillimis *hujus rei veritatem perquirere, ſcientes quod tanti Secreti myſterium non niſi divinitate revelante poſſit agnoſci, quæ ſine perſonarum acceptione, per quoſcunque delegerit, ſuæ veritatis lumen oſtendit.*

IV. *Noſtræ vero tenuitati, quam ſit jucundum Veſtro parere imperio, tam eſt arduum ſuper re* a *humanis ſenſibus remotiſſima, &* b *niſi per Sancti Spiritus eruditionem non* c *poſſe penetrare, diſputare. Subditus igitur veſtræ Magnitudinis juſſioni, confiſus autem ipſius de quo locuturi ſumus ſuffragio, quibus potuero verbis, quid ex*d *hoc ſentiam aperire tentabo, non proprio fretus Ingenio, ſed Sanctorum veſtigia Patrum proſequendo.*

---

a *L. ab humanis.*
b *Quam niſi.*
c *Poſſem penetrare.*
Vel quæ non niſi per Sancti Spiritus eruditionem non poteſt penetrari. d *Impreſ.* de.

Quod

viſions, and being withal deſirous that as the Apoſtle commands, *All Men ſhould think and ſpeak the ſame thing*; doth diligently ſearch out this profound Truth, that you may reduce thoſe who err from it, and for that purpoſe diſdain not to conſult the meaneſt; well knowing, that ſo profound a Myſtery cannot be underſtood, unleſs God reveal it, who ſhews forth the Light of his Truth, by whomſoever he pleaſes, without Reſpect of Perſons.

The Conſul. *Ratramnus* in the Controverſie.

IV. And for my own part, your Commands I joyfully obey, notwithſtanding the great difficulty I find to diſcourſe, on a ſubject ſo remote from humane Underſtanding, and which no Man (unleſs taught by the Holy Ghoſt) can poſſibly penetrate. Therefore in pure Obedience to your Majeſty, and with an entire confidence of his aid, concerning whom I am to Treat; I ſhall endeavour in as proper Terms as I am able, to deliver my Sentiments on this Subject; not relying on my own Underſtanding, but following the ſteps of the Holy Fathers.

V. *Quod in Eccleſia ore fidelium ſumitur Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti, quærit veſtræ Magnitudinis Excellentia, in Myſterio fiat, an in Veritate? id eſt, Utrum aliquid Secreti contineat, quod oculis ſolummodo fidei pateat; an ſine cujuſcunque velatione Myſterii, hoc aſpectus intueatur Corporis exterius, quod mentis viſus ſpiciat interius, ut totum quod agitur in manifeſtationis luce clareſcat? Et utrum ipſum Corpus* a *quod de* Maria *natum eſt & paſſum, mortuum & ſepultum, quodque reſurgens & cœlos aſcendens ad dextram Patris conſideat?*

VI. *Harum duarum Quæſtionum primam inſpiciamus, & ne dubietatis ambage detineamur, definiamus quid ſit* Figura, *quid* Veritas; *ut certum aliquid contuentes noverimus, quo rationis iter contendere debeamus.*

VII. Figura *eſt obumbratio quædam, quibuſdam velaminibus quod intendit oſtendens; verbi gratia,* Verbum *volentes dicere* Panem *nuncupamus: Sicut in*

a *Deeſt* ſit.

Ora-

V. YOur moſt Excellent Majeſty demands, Whether the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which is in the Church received by the mouths of the Faithful, be ſuch in a *Myſtery*, or in *Truth?* That is, Whether it contain any ſecret thing diſcernable only by the eyes of Faith; or whether without the Coverture of any Myſtery, the ſame thing appeareth outwardly to the bodily Sight, which the eyes of the Mind do inwardly behold, ſo that the whole matter is apparent and manifeſt to our Senſes? And whether it be the ſame Body which was Born of *Mary*, and Suffered, Died, and was Buried, and Riſing again and aſcending into Heaven, ſits at the Right Hand of the Father. The Stat. of the Controverſie in two Queſtions.

VI. Let us conſider the firſt of theſe two Queſtions. And that we be not confounded by the Ambiguity of Terms, let us define what a *Figure* is, and what the *Truth*; that having ſome certain mark in our Eye, we may know how the better to direct the courſe of our Reaſoning. The firſt Queſtion diſcuſſed.

VII. A *Figure* is a certain covert manner of Expreſſion, which exhibits what it intends under certain Vails. For example; We call the *Word*, What a Figure is.

Bread,

Oratione Dominica panem quotidianum dari nobis *expoſtulamus, vel cum Chriſtus in Evangelio loquitur, dicens,* Ego ſum panis vivus, qui de cœlo deſcendi; *vel cum ſeipſum* vitem, *diſcipulos autem* palmites *appellat,* a Ego ſum vitis vera, vos autem palmites: *hæc enim omnia aliud dicunt & aliud innuunt.*

VIII. Veritas *vero eſt rei manifeſtæ demonſtratio, nullis umbrarum imaginibus obvelatæ, ſed puris & apertis, utque planius eloquamur, naturalibus ſignificationibus inſinuatæ; utpote eum dicitur, Chriſtus natus de Virgine, paſſus, crucifixus, mortuus & ſepultus; nihil enim hic figuris obvelantibus adumbratur, verum rei veritas naturalium ſignificationibus verborum oſtenditur, neque aliud hic licet intelligi quam dicitur. At in ſuperioribus non ita; Nam ſubſtantialiter nec* Panis *Chriſtus, nec* Vitis *Chriſtus, nec* palmites *Apoſtoli. Quapropter hic* Figura, *ſuperius vero* Veritas *in narratione monſtratur, id eſt, nuda & aperta Significatio.*

---

a Impreſſi Codd. addunt, *dicens.*

Nunc

Bread, as in the Lords Prayer, we beg that God would give us *our daily Bread:* Or as Chriſt in the Goſpel ſpeaks, * *I am the Living Bread that came down from Heaven.* Or when he calls himſelf a *Vine*, and his Diſciples *Branches*, || *I am the true Vine, and ye are the Branches.* In all theſe Inſtances, one thing is ſaid and another thing is underſtood.

VIII. *The Truth* is the Repreſentation of the very thing it ſelf, not vailed with any Shadow or Figure, but expreſſed according to the pure and naked (or to ſpeak more plainly yet) natural Signification of the words. As when we ſay that Chriſt was Born of a Virgin, Suffered, was Crucified, Dead and Buried: Here is nothing ſhadowed out under the coverture of Figures, but the very Truth of the thing is expreſſed, according to the natural Signification of the words; nor is any thing here underſtood but what is ſaid. But in the forementioned Inſtances it is not ſo. For † in Subſtance, neither is Chriſt *Bread*, or a *Vine*, nor the Apoſtles

* John 6. 51. || John 15. 1, 5.

† *i.e.* In propriety of Nature: So the Saxon Homily, ſ͡ɛ͡ꝼtɛn ſoðum ʒecẏnꝺ niſ Cniſt naþon ne hlaꝼ. *Bran-*

IX. Nunc redeamus ad illa, quorum cauſa dicta ſunt iſta, videlicet Corpus & Sanguinem Chriſti. Si enim nulla ſub figura Myſterium illud peragitur, jam Myſterium non recte vocitatur; quoniam Myſterium dici non poteſt, in quo nihil eſt abditum, nihil a corporalibus ſenſibus remotum, nihil aliquo velamine contectum. At ille Panis qui per ſacerdotis miniſterium Chriſti Corpus conficitur, aliud exterius humanis ſenſibus oſtendit, & aliud interius fidelium mentibus clamat. Exterius quidem panis, quod ante fuerat, Forma prætenditur, Color oſtenditur, Sapor accipitur: Aſt interius longe aliud multo pretioſus, multoque excellentius intimatur, quia cæleſte, quia divinum, id eſt, Chriſti corpus oſtenditur, quod non ſenſibus carnis, ſed animi fidelis contuitu, vel aſpicitur, vel accipitur vel comeditur.

X. Vinum quoque quod ſacerdotali Conſecratione Chriſti Sanguinis efficitur ſacramentum, aliud ſuperficie tenus oſtendit,

Branches. Theſe are *Figures*, but in the other, the plain and naked *Truth* is related.

IX. Now let us return to the Subject which hath occaſioned the ſaying of all this, *viz*. the Body and Blood of Chriſt. If there be no figure in that Myſtery, it is not properly called a Myſtery; for that cannot be ſaid to be a Myſtery, which hath nothing ſecret, nothing remote from our bodily Senſes, nothing covered under any Vail. But as for that Bread which by the Miniſtry of the Prieſt, is made Chriſt's Body, it ſheweth one thing outwardly to our Senſes, and inwardly proclaims quite another thing to the minds of the Faithful. That which outwardly appears is Bread, as it was before in Form, Colour and Taſte: But inwardly there is quite another thing preſented to us, and that much more precious and excellent, becauſe it is Heavenly and Divine: That is, Chriſt's Body is exhibited which is beheld, received, and eaten,, not by our carnal Senſes, but by the ſight of the believing Soul.

He proves the Sacrament to be a Figure from the notion of a Myſtery or a Sacrament.

X. Likewiſe the Wine, which by the Prieſts Conſecration, is made the Sacrament of Chriſt's Blood, appears one

dit, aliud interius continet. Quid enim aliud in ſuperficie quam ſubſtantia vini conſpicitur? Guſta, vinum ſapit, Odora, vinum redolet: Inſpice, vini color intuetur. At interius ſi conſideres, jam non liquor Vini, ſed liquor Sanguinis Chriſti, credentium mentibus & ſapit dum guſtatur, & agnoſcitur dum conſpicitur, & probatur dum odoratur. Hæc ita eſſe dum nemo poteſt abnegare, claret quia panis ille vinumque figurate *Chriſti Corpus & Sanguis exiſtit. Non enim ſecundum quod videtur, vel carnis ſpecies in illo pane cognoſcitur, vel in illo vino cruoris unda monſtratur, cum tamen poſt Myſticam Conſecrationem nec panis jam dicitur nec vinum, ſed Chriſti Corpus & Sanguis.*

XI. Nam ſi ſecundum quoſdam figurate nihil hic accipiatur, ſed totum in veritate conſpiciatur, nihil hic fides operatur, quoniam nihil ſpirituale geritur, ſed quicquid illud eſt totum ſecundum Corpus accipitur. Et cum Fides *ſecundam Apoſtolum ſit* rerum argumentum non apparentium, *id eſt, non earum quæ videntur, ſed quæ non videntur ſubſtantiarum, nihil hic*

one thing outwardly, and inwardly contains another: For what doth outwardly appear but the ſubſtance of Wine? Taſt it, there is the reliſh of Wine; ſmell it, there is the ſcent of Wine; behold it, there is the colour of Wine. But if you conſider it inwardly, then it is not the Liquor of Wine, but the Liquor of Chriſt's Blood, which is Taſted, Seen, and Smelt. Since theſe things are undeniable, 'tis evident, that the Bread and Wine are *Figuratively* the Body and Blood of Chriſt: As to outward appearance, there is neither the Likeneſs of Fleſh to be ſeen in that Bread, nor the Liquor of Blood in that Wine, and yet after the myſtical Conſecration, they are no longer called Bread and Wine, but the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

XI. If according to the Opinion of ſome Men, here is nothing Figuratively taken, but the whole Matter is real, then Faith operates nothing, here is nothing Spiritual done, but the whole is to be underſtood altogether corporally. And ſeeing * *Faith* is according to the Apoſtle, *the Evi-*

Another Argument from the nature of Faith.

* Heb. 11. 1.

dence

hic secundum fidem accipiemus, quoniam quicquid existit secundum sensus corporis dijudicamus. Et nihil absurdius quam panem Carnem accipere, & vinum Sanguinem dicere. Nec jam Mysterium erit in quo nihil secreti, nihil abditi continebitur.

XII. Et quomodo jam Corpus Christi a *dicetur, in quo nulla permutatio facta esse cognoscitur? Omnis enim permutatio aut ex eo quod non est in id quod est efficitur, aut ex eo quod est in id quod non est, aut ex eo quod est in id quod est. In isto autem Sacramento si tantum in veritatis simplicitate consideratur & non aliud credatur, quam quod aspicitur, nulla permutatio facta cognoscitur. Nam nec ex eo quod non erat transivit in aliquid quod sit, quomodo sit transitus in rebus nascentibus: Siquidem non erant prius, sed ut sint, ex non esse ad id quod est esse transitum fecerunt. Hic vero panis & vinum prius fuere quam transitum in Sacramentum Corporis & Sanguinis Christi fecerunt.*

Sed nec ille Transitus qui fit ex eo quod est esse ad id quod est non esse, qui transitus

---

a Codd. impressi addunt & *Sanguis*.

in

dence of things that appear not, that is, not of Subſtances which are ſeen, but of ſuch as are not ſeen; we here ſhall receive nothing by Faith, becauſe we judge of the whole matter by our bodily Senſes. And nothing is more abſurd, than to take Bread for Fleſh, or to ſay that Wine is Blood: Nor can that be any longer a Myſtery in which there is no Secret, no hidden thing contained.

XII. And how can that be ſtiled Chriſt's Body and Blood, in which there is not any change known to be made; For every change is either from *not being to being*, or from *being to not being*, or elſe † from *one being into another*. But in this Sacrament, if the thing be conſidered in ſimplicity and verity, and nothing elſe be believed but what is ſeen, we know of no change at all made. For there is no change from *not being to being*, as in the production of things. Since ſuch did not exiſt before, but paſt from a ſtate of Non-entity into Being. Whereas here Bread and Wine were real Beings before they became the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body and Blood.

There muſt be a Spiritual change, for there is no Phyſical change wrought in the Sacrament.

No Generation.

† That is, from *one quality to another*.

in rebus per defectum occaſum patientibus exiſtit. Quicquid enim interit, prius ſubſiſtendo fuit; nec interitum pati poteſt, quod nunquam fuit. Hic quoque non iſte tranſitus factus eſſe cognoſcitur, quoniam ſecundum veritatem ſpecies creaturæ quæ fuerat ante, permanſiſſe cognoſcitur.

XIII. Item illa permutatio quæ fit ex eo quod eſt in id quod eſt, quæ perſpicitur in rebus qualitatis varietatem patientibus (verbi gratia, quando quod ante nigrum fuerat in album demutatur) nec hic facta eſſe cognoſcitur: nihil enim hic vel tactu, vel colore, vel ſapore permutatum eſſe deprehenditur. Si ergo nihil hic eſt permutatum, non eſt aliud quam ante fuit. Eſt autem aliud, quoniam panis Corpus & vinum Sanguis Chriſti facta ſunt. Sic enim ipſe dicit Accipite & comedite, hoc eſt corpus meum. *Similiter & de calice loquens dicit,* Accipite & bibite, hoc eſt Sanguis Novi Teſtamenti, qui pro vobis fundetur.

XIV. Qua-

Nor is here a paſſage from being, to not being, as there is in things decayed and corrupted: For whatever periſheth, once did ſubſiſt, and that cannot periſh, that never was. Now it is certain, that there is no change of this kind made, for 'tis well known, that the Nature of the Creatures remains in truth, the very ſame that they were before. Nor Corruption.

XIII. And as for that ſort of change, whereby one thing is rendred another, which is ſeen in things liable to vary in their qualities; (as for example, when a thing that was before black is made white;) it is plain, that this change is not made here. For we can perceive no alteration here either as to touch, colour, or taſte. Therefore if nothing be changed, [the Elements] are nothing but what they were before. And yet they are another thing, for the Bread is made the Body, and the Wine is made the Blood of Chriſt. For he himſelf hath ſaid, * *Take, eat, this is my Body.* And likewiſe ſpeaking of the Cup, he ſaith, † *Take and drink, this is my Blood of the New Teſtament which ſhall be ſhed for you.* Nor Alteration.

* Matth. 26. 26.

† Mark 14. 24.

XIV. Quærendum ergo eſt ab eis, qui nihil hic figurate volunt accipere, ſed totum in veritatis ſimplicitate conſiſtere, ſecundum quod demutatio facta ſit, ut jam non ſint quod ante fuerunt, videlicet panis atque vinum, ſed ſint corpus atque ſanguis Chriſti? Secundum ſpeciem namque creaturæ, formamque rerum viſibilium, utrumque hoc, id eſt, panis & vinum, nihil habent in ſe permutatum. Et ſi nihil permutationis pertulerunt, nihil aliud exiſtunt quam quod prius fuere.

XV. Cernit Sublimitas veſtra, Princeps glorioſe, quo a *taliter ſentientium intellectus evadat, negant quod affirmare creduntur, & quod credunt deſtruere comprobantur. Corpus etenim Sanguinemque Chriſti fideliter confitentur, & cum hoc faciunt, non hoc jam eſſe quod prius fuere proculdubio proteſtantur. Et ſi aliud ſunt quam fuere mutationem accepere. Cum hoc negari non poſſit, dicant ſecundum quid permutata ſunt? corporaliter namque nihil in eis cernitur eſſe permutatum. Fatebuntur igitur neceſſe eſt, aut mutata eſſe ſecundum aliud quam ſecundnm Corpus, ac per hoc, non eſſe hoc quod in veritate videntur, ſed aliud quod non eſſe ſecundum* b *eſ-*

a *Codd. Impreſſi legunt* aliter.
b *Impreſſi legunt* Exiſtentia n.

ſentiam

XIV. I would now enquire of them who will take nothing Figuratively, but will have the whole matter plainly and really tranſacted. In what reſpect is this change made, ſo that the things are not now what they were before, to wit, Bread and Wine, but the Body and Blood of Chriſt? For as to the Nature of the Creature, and the form of the viſible things, both (to wit) the Bread and Wine, have nothing changed in them. And if they have undergone no change, they are nothing but what they were before.

XV. Your Highneſs ſees, Illuſtrious Prince, the tendency of their opinion who think thus: They deny what they ſeem to affirm, and plainly overthrow what they believe. For they faithfully confeſs the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and in ſo doing, no doubt they profeſs that [the Elements] are not what they were before. And if they now are other than they were before, they have admitted ſome change. This [inference] being undeniable, let them now tell us, in what reſpect they are changed? For we ſee nothing corporally changed in them. Therefore, they muſt needs acknowledge, either that they are changed in

They who will admit no figure in the Sacrament contradict themſelves.

eſſentiam propriam cernuntur : Aut ſi hoc profiteri noluerint, c *compelluntur negare Corpus eſſe Sanguinemque Chriſti, quod nefas eſt non ſolum dicere, verum etiam cogitare.*

XVI. At quia conſitentur & Corpus & Sanguinem d *Dei eſſe, nec hoc eſſe potuiſſe niſi facta in melius commutatione, neque iſta commutatio corporaliter ſed ſpiritaliter facta ſit, neceſſe eſt* e *jam ut* figurate *facta eſſe dicatur : quoniam ſub velamento corporei panis, corporeique vini, ſpirituale corpus Chriſti ſpiritualiſque ſanguis exiſtit. Non quod duarum ſint exiſtentiæ verum inter ſe diverſarum corporis videlicet & Spiritus, verum una eademque res ſecundum aliud ſpecies panis & vini conſiſtit, ſecundum aliud autem Corpus eſt & Sanguis Chriſti. Secundum namque quod utrumque corporaliter contingitur ſpecies ſunt creaturæ corporeæ ; ſecundum potentiam vero, quod ſpiritualiter factæ ſunt,* Myſteria *ſunt Corpo-*

c *Impr. compellentur.*
d *Codd. Impreſſi legunt* Chriſti.
e *Impreſſi.* Ut jam.

XVII. Con-

ſome other reſpect than that of their Bodies, and in this reſpect *they are*, what we ſee *they are not in truth*, but ſomewhat elſe, which we diſcern them *not to be in their proper Eſſence*, or if they will not acknowledge this, they will be compelled to deny that they are Chriſt's Body and Blood; which is abominable not only to ſpeak, but even to think.

XVI. But ſince they do confeſs them to be the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which they could not have been, but by a change for the better, nor is this change wrought Corporally, but Spiritually: It muſt neceſſarily be ſaid to be wrought *Figuratively*. Becauſe under the Vail of material Bread, and material Wine; the Spiritual Body, and Spiritual Blood of Chriſt do exiſt: Not that there are together exiſting, two natures ſo different, as a Body and Spirit: But one and the ſame thing, in one reſpect, hath the nature of Bread and Wine; and in another reſpect, is the Body and Blood of Chriſt. For both as they are Corporally handled, are in their nature Corporeal Creatures; but according to their Virtue, and what they are Spiritually made, they are *Myſteries*

vis, & Sanguinis Christi.

XVII. Consideremus sacri Fontem Baptismatis, qui fons vitæ non immerito nuncupatur, quia descendentes in se melioris vitæ novitate reformat, & de peccato mortuis viventes justitiæ donat. Num secundum quod aquæ conspicitur elementum esse istam potentiam obtinet? Attamen nisi sanctificationis virtutem obtineret, labem vitiorum nequaquam diluere possit. Et nisi vigorem vitæ contineret, nullo modo mortuis præstare vitam valeret, mortuis autem non carne sed anima: In eo tamen fonte si consideretur solummodo quod corporeus aspicit sensus, Elementum fluidum conspicitur, corruptioni subjectum, nec nisi corpora lavandi potentiam obtinere. Sed accessit Sancti Spiritus per Sacerdotis consecrationem virtus, & efficax facta est non solum corpora verum etiam animas diluere & spirituales sordes spirituali potentia dimovere.

XVIII. Ecce in uno eodemq; Elemento duo videmus inesse sibi resistentia, id est, corruptioni subjacens incorruptionem præstare, & vitam non habens vitam contribuere. Cognoscitur ergo in isto Fonte

&

of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

XVII. Let us conſider the Font of holy Baptiſm, which is not undeſervedly ſtiled the Fountain of Life, becauſe it regenerates thoſe who deſcend into it, to the Newneſs of a better Life; and makes thoſe who were dead in Sins, alive unto Righteouſneſs. Is it the viſible Element of Water which hath this efficacy? Verily, unleſs it had obtained a Sanctifying virtue, it could by no means waſh away the ſtain of our Sins: And if it had not a quickning Power, it could not at all give Life to the Dead. The Dead, I mean not as to their Bodies, but their Souls. Yet if in that Fountain you conſider nothing but what the bodily Senſe beholdeth, you ſee only a fluid Element of a corruptible Nature, and capable of waſhing the Body only. But the Power of the Holy Ghoſt, came upon it by the Prieſts Conſecration,& it obtained thereby an efficacy to waſh not the Bodies only, but alſo the Souls of Men;and by a Spitual virtue, to take away their Spiritual filth.

He Illuſtrates the matter by comparing the two Sacraments of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Body.

XVIII. Behold, how in one and the ſame Element, are ſeen two things contrary to each other; a thing Corruptible, giving Incorruption; and a thing

& ineſſe quod ſenſus Corporis attingat, & idcirco mutabile atque corruptibile; & rurſus ineſſe quod fides ſola conſpiciat, & ideo nec corrumpi poſſe, nec vitæ diſcrimen accipere. Si requiras quod ſuperficie tenus lavat, Elementum eſt, ſi vero perpendas quod interius purgat, virtus vitalis eſt, virtus Sanctificationis, virtus Immortalitatis. Igitur in Proprietate humor corruptibilis, in Myſterio vero virtus ſanabilis.

XIX. Sic itaque Chriſti Corpus & Sanguis ſuperficie tenus conſiderata, creatura eſt mutabilitati corruptelæque ſubjecta. Si Myſterii vero perpendas virtutem, vita eſt participantibus ſe tribuens immortalitatem. Non ergo ſunt idem quod cernuntur & quod creduntur: Secundum enim quod cernuntur corpus paſcunt corruptibile, ipſa corruptibilia. Secundum vero quod creduntur animas paſcunt in æternum victuras, ipſa immortalia.

Apo-

thing without Life, giving Life. It is manifeſt then, that in the Font, there is both ſomewhat, which the bodily ſenſe perceiveth, which is therefore mutable and corruptible; and ſomewhat which the Eye of Faith only beholds, and therefore is neither Corruptible nor Mortal. If you enquire what waſhes the outſide, it is the Element; but if you conſider what purgeth the inſide, it is a quickning power, a Sanctifying power, a power conferring Immortality. So then in its own nature, it is a Corruptible Liquor, but in the Myſtery 'tis a Healing Power.

XIX. Thus alſo the Body and Blood of Chriſt, conſidered as to the outſide only, is a creature ſubject to change and Corruption. But if you ponder the efficacy of the Myſtery, it is Life conferring Immortality, on ſuch as partake thereof. Therefore they are not the ſame things which are ſeen, and which are believed. For the things ſeen, feed a Corruptible Body, being corruptible themſelves. But thoſe which are believed, feed immortal Souls, being themſelves immortal.

XX. The

XX. Apoſtolus quoque ſcribens Corinthiis *ait*; Neſcitis quoniam partes noſtri omnes ſub nube fuerunt, & omnes Mare tranſierunt, & omnes in Moſe baptizati ſunt in nube & in mari, & omnes eandem eſcam ſpiritualem manducaverunt, & omnes eundem potum ſpiritualem biberunt? Bibebant autem de ſpirituali conſequenti eos petra; Petra autem erat Chriſtus. *Animadvertimus & mare Baptiſmi ſpeciem prætuliſſe & nubem; patresq; prioris Teſtamenti in eis, id eſt, in nube ſive mari Baptizatos* a *fuiſſe. Num vel mare ſecundum quod elementum videbatur, Baptiſmi potuit habere virtutem; Vel nubes juxta quod denſioris craſſitudinem aeris oſtendebat, populum Sanctificare quiverit? Nec tamen Apoſtolum in Chriſto locutum audemus dicere, quod non vere dixerit, patres noſtros in nube & in mari eſſe Baptizatos.*

XXI. Et quamvis Baptiſmus ille formam Baptiſmatis Chriſti quod hodie geritur in Eccleſia non prætulerit, Baptiſmum tamen extitiſſe & in eo patres noſtros

a *Impreſſi* eſſe.

Bapti-

XX. The Apoſtle alſo writing to the *Corinthians*, ſaith, * *Know ye not, how that all our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all paſſed through the Sea and were all Baptized unto Moſes in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and did all eat the ſame Spiritual Meat, and did all Drink the ſame Spiritual Drink; for they drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them: And that Rock was Chriſt.* We ſee both the Sea and the Cloud bore a reſemblance of Baptiſm; and that the Fathers of the Old Teſtament were Baptized in them, *viz.* the Cloud and the Sea. Now could the Sea, as a viſible Element, have the power of Baptizing? Or could the Cloud as a condenſation of the Air, Sanctifie the People? And yet we dare not ſay, but that the Apoſtle who ſpake in Chriſt, did truly affirm, that our Fathers were Baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea.

This is further illuſtrated by the Baptiſm of the Fathers in the Sea and Cloud and by the Manna and Spiritual Rock, which afforded Meat and Drink to the Fathers.

XXI. And although that Baptiſm was not the ſame with the Chriſtian Baptiſm, now Celebrated in the Church, yet that it was Baptiſm, and that our Fathers were therewith Baptized, no Man in his Wits will deny.

* 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3.

None

*Baptizatos fuiſſe, nullus negare ſanus audebit, niſi verbis Apoſtoli contralicere veſanus præſumpſerit. Igitur & mare & nubes non ſecundum hoc quod Corpus extiterant, ſanctificationis munditiam præbuere; verum ſecundum quod inviſibiliter Sancti Spiritus ſanctificationem continebant. Erat namq; in eis * viſibilis forma quæ Corporeis ſenſibus appareret, non in imagine ſed in veritate; Et interius ſpiritualis potentia refulgebat quæ non carnis Oculis, ſed mentis Luminibus appareret.*

XXII. Similiter Manna populo de cœlo datum, & aqua profluens de petra, corporales extiterant, & corporaliter populum vel paſcebant, vel potabant; attamen Apoſtolus vel illud Manna vel illam aquam, Spiritualem eſcam, & ſpiritualem potum appellat. Cur hoc? Quoniam inerat Corporeis illis ſubſtantiis Spiritualis verbi poteſtas, quæ Mentes potius quam Corpora credentium paſceret atque potaret. Et cum cibus vel potus ille futuri corporis Chriſti ſanguiniſque myſterium quod celebrat Eccle-

* *Mendoſa procul dubio eſt lectio in omnibus* Ratramni *quot quot vidi editionibus* inviſibilis, *quod & ex MS. Laub. conſtat.*

ſia

None but a man that would preſume expreſly to contradict the Words of the Apoſtle: Therefore the *Sea* and *Cloud* did ſanctifie and cleanſe; not as they were meer bodily Subſtances, but as they did inviſibly contain the ſanctifying Power of the Holy Ghoſt: For there was in them both a viſible Form appearing to the bodily Eyes, not in Image, but in Truth; and alſo a ſpiritual Virtue, ſhining within, which was not diſcernable by the bodily Eyes, but by thoſe of the Mind.

XXII. Likewiſe the Manna which was given the People from Heaven, and the Water flowing out of the Rock, were corporeal Subſtances, and were both meat and Drink for the nouriſhment of the Peoples Bodies. Nevertheleſs the Apoſtle calls even that Manna, and that Water, ſpiritual Meat, and ſpiritual Drink. Why ſo? Becauſe there was in thoſe bodily Subſtances a ſpiritual Power of the Word, which rather feed and gave Drink to the minds, than the Bodies of the Faithful. And whereas that Meat and Drink prefigured the future Myſtery of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which the Church now Celebrates. St. *Paul* nevertheleſs affirms, That

ſia præmonſtraret, eandem tamen eſcam ſpiritualem manducaſſe, a *eundem potum ſpiritualem bibiſſe Patres noſtros Sanctus* Paulus *aſſeverat.*

XXIII. Quæris fortaſſe, Quam eandem? Nimirum ipſam quam hodie Populus Credentium in Eccleſia manducat & bibit. Non enim licet diverſam b *intelligi, quoniam unus idemq; Chriſtus eſt, qui & populum in deſerto in Nube & in Mari Baptizatum ſua carne pavit, ſuo ſanguine tunc potavit, & in Eccleſia nunc Credentium populum ſui corporis pane, ſui ſanguinis unda paſcit & potat.*

XXIV. Quod volens Apoſtolus intimare, cum dixiſſet Patres noſtros eandem eſcam ſpiritualem manducaſſe, eundemq; potum ſpiritualem bibiſſe, conſequenter adjecit, Bibebant autem de ſpirituali conſequenti eos Petra; Petra autem erat Chriſtus. *Ut intelligeremus in deſerto Chriſtum in ſpirituali petra conſtitiſſe, & ſui ſanguinis undam populo præbuiſſe, qui poſtea Corpus de Virgine ſumptum, & pro ſalute Credentium in cruce ſuſpenſum, noſtris ſæculis exhibuit,*

a *Cood. Impr.* & eundem.
b *Codd. Impr.* diverſa.

That *our Fathers did eat the ſame Spiritual Meat, and drank the ſame Spiritual Drink.*

XXIII. Perhaps you will ask, What ſame? Even the very ſelf-ſame [Food] which the Faithful now eat and drink in the Church. Nor may we think them different, ſince it is one and the ſame Chriſt, who then in the Wilderneſs fed the People, that were Baptized, in the Cloud and in the Sea with his own Fleſh, and made them to drink his own Blood, and who now, in the Church, feeds the Faithful with the Bread of his Body, and makes them to drink the Liquor of his Blood.

In what ſenſe the Fathers eat and drank the ſame ſpiritual Meat and Drink with us.

XXIV. The Apoſtle intending to intimate thus much, when he had ſaid that our Fathers did eat the ſame Spiritual Meat, and drank the ſame Spiritual Drink; he adds, *And they all drank of that Spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt:* To the end we might underſtand, that in the Wilderneſs Chriſt was in the Spiritual Rock, and gave the Liquor of his Blood to the People; who afterwards * in our times exhibited his Body, born of a Virgin, and Crucified for the Salvation of ſuch as believe; out of which he ſhed ſtreams of Blood,

* That is under the Goſpel.

& ex eo ſanguinis undam effudit, quo non ſolum redimeremur, verum etiam potaremur.

*XXV. Mirum certe, quoniàm incomprehenſibile & inæſtimabile! Nondum hominem aſſumſerat; nondum pro ſalute mundi mortem deguſtaverat; nondum ſanguine ſuo nos redemerat; & jam noſtri patres in deſerto per eſcam ſpiritualem, potumque inviſibilem ejus Corpus manducabant, & ejus Sanguinem bibebant, velut teſtis * extat Apoſtolus; clamans,* Eandem eſcam ſpiritualem manducaſſe, eundem potum ſpiritualem bibiſſe Patres noſtros. *Non iſtic Ratio qua fieri potuerit diſquirenda, ſed Fides quod factum ſit adhibenda. Ipſe namque qui nunc in Eccleſia omnipotenti virtute Panem & Vinum in ſui Corporis carnem, & proprii cruoris undam ſpiritualiter convertit, ipſe tunc quoque Manna de cœlo, datum Corpus ſuum & Aquam de Petra profuſam proprium ſanguinem inviſibiliter operatus eſt.*

XXVI. Quod intelligens David, *in Spiritu Sancto proteſtatus eſt*; Panem, *inquiens,* Angelorum manducavit ho-

* *Exiſtit.* Edit. Colon.

mo.

whereof we are made to drink, and not only redeemed therewith.

XXV. Truly it is wonderful, becauſe it is incomprehenſible and ineſtimable! He had not yet aſſumed Man's Nature; he had not yet taſted of Death for the Salvation of the World; he had not yet redeemed us with his Blood; whenas our Fathers in the Wilderneſs, even then in their Spiritual Meat, and Inviſible Drink, did eat his Body, and drink his Blood, as the Apoſtle teſtifies; ſaying, That *our Fathers did eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat, and drank of the ſame ſpiritual Drink.* Now we muſt not enquire how that could be; but muſt believe that it was ſo: For he, who now in the Church, doth by his Almighty Power, ſpiritually change Bread and Wine into the Fleſh of his own Body, and the Liquor of his own Blood; he alſo did inviſibly make the Manna given from Heaven, his own Body, and the Water iſſuing from the Rock, his own Blood.

XXVI. Which *David* underſtanding, ſpake by the Holy Ghoſt, ſaying, (a) *Man did eat Angels Food.* For it is

(a) Pſal. 27. 25.

mo. *Ridiculum namque eſt opinari, quod Manna corporeum Patribus datum cœleſtem paſcat exercitum, aut tali veſcantur edulio, qui divini Verbi ſaginantur epulis. Oſtendit certe* Pſalmiſta, *vel magis Spiritus Sanctus loquens in* Pſalmiſta, *vel quid Patres noſtri in illo Manna cœleſti perceperunt, vel quid Fideles in Myſterio Corporis Chriſti credere debeant. In utroque Chriſtus certe innuitur, qui & Credentium animas paſcit, & Angelorum cibus exiſtit. Utrumque hoc incorporeo guſtu, nec corporali ſagina, ſed ſpiritualis Verbi virtute.*

XXVII. Et Evangeliſta *narrante cognovimus*, Quod Dominus Jeſus Chriſtus priuſquam pateretur, accepto pane, gratias egit, & dedit Diſcipulis ſuis, dicens, Hoc eſt Corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur, hoc facite in meam commemorationem. Similiter & Calicem poſtquam cœnavit, dicens, Hic eſt Calix novum Teſtamentum in ſanguine meo, qui pro vobis fundetur. *Videmus nondum paſſum eſſe Chriſtum, & jam tamen ſui corporis*

ridiculous to imagine, That the corporeal Manna given to the Fathers, doth feed the Heavenly Hoſt; or that they uſe ſuch Diet, who are ſatiated with Feaſting on the Divine Word. The *Pſalmiſt*, or rather, the Holy * Ghoſt ſpeaking of the *Pſalmiſt*, teacheth us, both what our Fathers received in that Heavenly Manna, and what the Faithful ought to believe in the Myſtery of Chriſt's Body. In both certainly Chriſt is ſignified; who both feeds the Souls of the Faithful, and is the Food of Angels: And both he doth and is by a ſpiritual Reliſh, not by becoming bodily Food, but by virtue of the ſpiritual Word.

He argues from the Inſtitution of this Sacrament before our Lord's Paſſion.

XXVII. We are taught alſo by the *Evangeliſt*, That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, before he Suffered, *took Bread, and when he had given Thanks, he gave it to his Diſciples; ſaying, This is my Body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of me. Likewiſe the Cup, after he had ſupped, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, which ſhall be ſhed for you.* You ſee Chriſt had not yet Suffered, and yet nevertheleſs he celebrated the My-

* Mat. 26. 26, 27, 28. Luke 22. 19, 20.

& ſanguinis Myſterium operatum fuiſſe.

XXVIII. Non enim putamus ullum Fidelium dubitare panem illum fuiſſe Chriſti Corpus effectum, quod Diſcipulis donans, dixit, Hoc eſt Corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur; *ſed neque Calicem dubitare ſanguinem Chriſti continere, de quo idem ait,* Hic eſt Calix novum Teſtamentum in ſanguine meo, qui pro vobis fundetur. *Sicut ergo paulo antequam pateretur Panis ſubſtantiam, & Vini Creaturam convertere potuit in proprium Corpus quod paſſurum erat, & in ſuum ſanguinem qui poſt fundendus extabat, ſic etiam in deſerto Manna & Aquam de petra in ſuam Carnem & Sanguinem convertere prævaluit, quamvis longe poſt & Caro illius in cruce pro nobis pendenda, & Sanguis ejus in ablutionem noſtram fundendus ſuperabat.*

XXIX. Hic etiam conſiderare debemus quemadmodum ſit accipiendum quod ipſe dicit; Niſi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, & ſanguinem ejus biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis. *Non enim dicit, quod Caro ipſius quæ pependit in cruce, particulatim conciſenda foret, & a Diſcipulis manducanda,*

ſtery of his own Body and Blood.

XXVIII. For I am confident, no Chriſtian doubts, but that Bread was made the Body of Chriſt, which he gave to his Diſciples, ſaying, *This is my Body which is given for you*; or but the Cup contains the Blood of Chriſt, of which he alſo ſaith, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, which ſhall be ſhed for you.* Wherefore, as a little before his Paſſion, he could change the Subſtance of Bread, and the Creature of Wine, into his own Body, which was to Suffer, and his own Blood, which was to be ſhed; ſo alſo could he in the Wilderneſs change Manna, and Water out of the Rock, into his Body and Blood, though it were a long time after, ere that Body was to be Crucified for us, or that Blood to be ſhed, to waſh us.

XXIX. Here alſo we ought to conſider how thoſe Words of our Saviour are to be underſtood, wherein he ſaith, * *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have not Life in you.* For he doth not ſay, that his Fleſh which hung on the Croſs, ſhould be cut in pieces, He expounds Joh. 6. 53.

* John 6. 53.

canda, vel Sanguis ipſius quem fuſurus erat pro mundi redemptione, Diſcipulis dandus eſſet in potum. Hoc enim ſcelus eſſet, ſi ſecundum quod infideles tunc acceperunt, a Diſcipulis vel Sanguis ejus biberetur, vel Caro comederetur.

*XXX. Propter quod in conſequentibus ait Diſcipulis, non infideliter ſed fideliter verba Chriſti ſuſcipientibus, nec tamen † quomodo illa verba intelligenda * penetrantibus*; Hoc vos ſcandalizat (*inquiens*) Si ergo videritis filium hominis aſcendentem ubi erat prius? *tanquam diceret, Non ergo Carnem meam vel Sanguinem meum vobis corporaliter comedendam, vel bibendum per partes diſtributum diſtribuendumve putetis, cum poſt Reſurrectionem viſuri ſitis me cœlos aſcenſurum cum integri Corporis ſive ſanguinis mei plenitudine. Tunc intelligetis quod non ſicut Infideles arbitrantur, carnem meam a Credentibus comedendam, ſed vere per Myſterium Panem & Vinum in Corporis & Sanguinis mei converſa Subſtantiam a credentibus ſumenda.*

† *Impreſſi habent* adhuc quomodo.
* *Adde* forent.

XXXI. Et

and eaten by his Diſciples; or that his Blood, which he was to ſhed for the Redemption of the World, ſhould be given his Diſciples to drink: For it had been a Crime for his Diſciples to have eaten his Fleſh, and drunk his Blood, in the ſenſe that the unbelieving *Jews* then underſtood him.

XXX. Wherefore, in the following words he ſaith to his Diſciples, who did not disbelieve that Saying of Chriſt, though they did not yet penetrate the true Meaning of it. * *Doth this offend you? What if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcending up where he was before?* As though he ſhould ſay, Think not that you muſt eat my Fleſh, and drink my Blood corporally, divided into ſmall pieces; for, when after my Reſurrection, you ſhall ſee me aſcend into the Heavens with my Body entire, and all my Blood: Then you ſhall underſtand that the Faithful muſt eat † my Fleſh, not in the manner which theſe Unbelievers imagine; but that indeed Believers muſt receive it, Bread and Wine being myſtically turned into the ſubſtance of my Body and Blood.

* John 6. 53. † John 6. 69.

XXXI. And

XXXI. Et conſequenter Spiritus eſt, *(inquit)* qui vivificat, Caro non prodeſt quicquam. *Carnem dicit quicquam non prodeſſe, illo modo ſicut Infideles intelligebant, alioquin vitam præbet, ſicut a Fidelibus per Myſterium ſumitur. Et hoc quare ? Ipſe manifeſtat cum dicit,* Spiritus eſt qui vivificat. *In hoc Itaque Myſterio Corporis & Sanguinis ſpiritualis eſt operatio quæ vitam præſtat, ſine cujus operatione Myſteria illa nihil proſunt ; quoniam Corpus quidem paſcere poſſunt, ſed Animam paſcere non poſſunt.*

XXXII. Hic jam ſuboritur Quæſtio, quam plurimi proponentes loquuntur, non in Figura, ſed in Veritate iſta fieri. Quod dicentes Sanctorum Scripta Patrum contraire comprobantur.

XXXIII. Sanctus † Auguſtinus, *Doctor Eccleſiæ præcipuus, in Libro De Doctrina Chriſtiana tertio taliter ſcribit :* Niſi manducaveritis *(inquit Salvator)* Carnem Filii hominis, & biberitis Sanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel Flagitium videtur jubere : Figura ergo eſt præcipiens Paſſioni Domini eſſe com-

† 3. Aug. *De Doct. Chriſt.* lib. 3. c. 16.

XXXI. And after, * *It's the Spirit,* ſaith he, *that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing.* He ſaith, *The Fleſh profiteth nothing*, taken as thoſe Infidels underſtood him, but otherwiſe it giveth Life, as it is taken myſtically by the Faithful. And why ſo? He himſelf ſhews, when he ſaith, *It is the Spirit that quickneth:* Therefore in this Myſtery of the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, there is a ſpiritual Operation, which giveth Life; without which Operation the Myſteries profit nothing; becauſe they may indeed feed the Body, but cannot feed the Soul. * John. 6. 66.

XXXII. Now there ariſeth a Queſtion, moved by many, who ſay that theſe things are done not in a Figure, but in Truth; but in ſo ſaying, they plainly contradict the Writings of the Fathers.

XXXIII. St. *Auguſtine*, an eminent Doctor of the Church, in his Third Book, *De Doctrina Chriſtiana* writes thus, *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man* (ſaith our Saviour) *and drink his Blood, you ſhall not have Life in you. He ſeems to command a flagitious Crime: Therefore the Words are a* FIGURE, *requiring us to communicate* St. *Auguſtine* quoted.

communicandum, & * fideliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis ejus Caro crucifixa & vulnerata ſit.

XXXIV. Cernimus quod Doctor iſte Myſteria Corpus & Sanguinis Chriſti ſub Figura *dicit a Fidelibus celebrari: Nam Carnem illius Sanguinemque ejus ſumere carnaliter, non* Religionis *dicit eſſe, ſed* Facinoris. *De quibus fuerant illi, qui in Evangelio dicta Domini non ſpiritualiter, ſed carnaliter intelligentes, receſſerunt ab eo, & jam cum illo non ibant.*

XXXV. Idem *in Epiſtola ad* Bonifacium *Epiſcopum ſcribens, inter reliqua, ſic ait*, Nempe, ſæpe ita loquimur, Ut *Paſcha* propinquente, dicamus craſtinam vel perendinam Domini Paſſionem, cum ille ante tam multos annos paſſus ſit, nec omnino niſi ſemel illa Paſſio facta ſit. Nempe, ipſo die Dominico dicimus, hodie Dominus reſurrexit, cum ex quo † reſurrexerit tot anni * tranſierint. Cur nemo tam ineptus eſt, ut nos ita loquentes arguat eſſe mentitos, niſi quia iſtos dies ſecundum illorum quibus

† *In editis* Reſurrecti.

* Tranſierunt *in editis.*

* *Apud* Auguſtinum *& in obiis editionibus* Ratramni *habetur*, & ſuaviter atque utiliter recondendum.

hæc

nicate in our Lord's Paſſion, and faithfully * *to lay up this in our Memory, that his Fleſh was Crucified and Wounded for us.*

XXXIV. We ſee this Doctor ſaith, that the Myſtery of Chriſt's Body and Blood is celebrated by the Faithful under a FIGURE. For he ſaith, To receive his Fleſh and Blood carnally, is not an *Act* of *Religion*, but of *Villany*. For which Cauſe, they in the Goſpel, who took our Saviour's Words not Spiritually, but Carnally, departed from him, and followed him no more.

XXXV. Likewiſe in his Epiſtle to *Boniface*, a Biſhop, among other things, he ſaith thus, *We often ſpeak in this manner, when* Eaſter *is near, we ſay, to Morrow, or the next day is the Lord's Paſſion, although he Suffered many Years ſince, and Suffered but once. Likewiſe, we ſay on the Lord's Day, This day our Lord roſe again, when yet ſo many years are paſſed ſince he roſe again. Why is no Man ſo fooliſh, as to charge us with Lying, when we ſpeak thus? But becauſe we call theſe Days after the likeneſs of*

* In the printed Edition of St. *Auguſtine* and *Bertram*, we read *ſweetly and profitably to lay up.*

thoſe

hæc gesta sunt similitudinem nuncupamus? Ut dicatur ipse dies qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus, & dicatur illo die fieri propter Sacramenti celebrationem, quod non illo die, sed jam olim factum || sit. Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? Et tamen in Sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ Solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur. Nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus, eum responderit immolari. Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem * rerum earum, quarum Sacramentum sunt non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent. Ex hac ipsa autem similitudine plerumque † jam ipsarum rerum Nomina accipiant. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum Sacramentum Corporis Christi, Corpus Christi est, Sacramentum Sanguinis Christi Sanguis Christi est: Ita (a) Sacramentum Fidei Fides est.

|| *In editis* est.

* *In editis* earum rerum.

† *In editis* etiam.

(a) i. e. *Baptismus*, ut patet ex eis quæ sequuntur, apud *Augustinum*, Ep. 23. quæ est ad *Bonifacium*. — *Ac per hoc cum respondetur* [i. e. in Baptismo] *parvulus credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei Sacramentum, & convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis Sacramentum.*

XXXVI. Cer-

those Days in which these things were really done. So that the Day is called such a Day; which in truth is not that very Day, but only like it in Revolution of Time; and by reason of the Celebration of the Sacrament, that is said to be done this Day, which was not done this very Day, but in Old Times. Was not Christ offered up once only in his own Person, and yet in the Sacrament he is offered for the People, not only every Easter, *but every Day? Nor doth that Man tell a Lye, who being asked, shall answer, that he is offered. For if Sacraments had not some Resemblance of those things, of which they are the Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. And from that Resemblance, they commonly take the Names of the Things themselves. Whereas the Sacrament of Christ's Body is in some sort the Body of Christ, and the Sacrament of Christ's Blood is in some sort the Blood of Christ, so the* (a) *Sacrament of the Faith, is the Faith.*

XXXVI. We see St. *Augustine* saith, that Sacraments are one thing, and

(a) The Sacrament of the Faith, *i. e.* Baptism, as appears by the following words in St. *Austin*, in his 23. Epistle, which is here cited.

the

XXXVI. Cernimus quod St. Auguſtinus *dicit aliud Sacramenta, & aliud Res quarum ſunt Sacramenta: Corpus autem in quo paſſus eſt Chriſtus, & Sanguis ejus de latere qui fluxit, res ſunt. Harum vero rerum Myſteria dicit eſſe Sacramenta Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti, quæ celebrantur ob memoriam Dominicæ Paſſionis, non ſolum per omnes Paſchæ Solemnitates ſingulis annis, verum etiam ſingulis in anno diebus.*

XXXVII. Et cum unum ſit Corpus Dominicum in quo ſemel paſſus eſt, & unus Sanguis qui pro Salute Mundi fuſus eſt, attamen Sacramenta ipſarum rerum vocabula ſumpſerunt, ut dicantur Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti, cum propter ſimilitudinem rerum quas innuunt, ſic appellentur. Sicut (b) *Paſcha & Reſurrectio Domini vocantur, quæ per ſingulos* (c) *annos celebrantur, cum ſemel in ſeipſo paſſus ſit & reſurrexerit, nec dies illi jam poſſint revocari, quoniam præterierint. Appellantur tamen illorum vocabulo, dies quibus memoria Dominicæ Paſſionis, ſive Reſurrectionis commemoratur, idcireo quod*

(b) *Lege* Paſſio.
(c) *In Imgreſſi* dies.

illorum

the things of which they are the Sacraments are another thing. Now the Body in which Chriſt ſuffered, and the Blood which iſſued out of his Side, are Things; but the Myſteries of theſe things, he ſaith, are Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are celebrated in Remembrance of our Lord's Paſſion; not only every Year, at the great Solemnity of *Eaſter*, but every day of the Year.

XXXVII. And whereas there was but one Body of the Lord, in which he ſuffered once, and one Blood, which was ſhed for the Salvation of the World; yet the Sacraments of theſe have aſſumed the Names of the very things; ſo that they are called the Body and Blood of Chriſt. And yet are ſo called, by reaſon of the Reſemblance they bear to the things which they ſignifie. As they ſtile theſe reſpective Days, which are annually celebrated, the Paſſion and Reſurrection of our Lord; whereas in truth he ſuffered, and roſe again, but once in his own Perſon; nor can the very Days return any more, being long ſince paſt. Nevertheleſs, the Days in which the Memory of our

illorum ſimilitudinem habeant dierum, quibus Salvator ſemel paſſus eſt, & ſemel reſurrexit.

XXXVIII. Unde dicimus, hodie, vel cras, vel perendie Domini * *Paſcha eſt, vel Reſurrectio, cum dies illi quibus hæc geſta ſunt, multis jam annis præterierint. Sic etiam dicamus Dominum immolari, quando Paſſionis ejus Sacramenta celebrantur, cum ſemel pro Salute Mundi ſit immolatus in ſeipſo, ſicut Apoſtolus ait*; Chriſtus paſſus eſt pro nobis, vobis relinquens exemplum, ut ſequamini Veſtigia ejus. *Non enim, quod quotidie in ſeipſo patiatur, quod ſemel fecit. Exemplum autem nobis reliquit, quod in Myſterio Dominici Corporis & Sanguinis quotidie Credentibus præſentatur, ut quiſquis ad illum acceſſerit, noverit ſe paſſionibus ejus ſociari debere, quarum imaginem in ſacris Myſteriis præſtolatur, juxta illud Sapientiæ*; Acceſſiſti ad Menſam Potentis, diligenter attende quæ tibi

* Paſſio.

ſunt

Lord's Paſſion or Reſurrection is celebrated, are called by the name of thoſe Days, becauſe they have ſome Reſemblance of thoſe very Days, in which our Saviour once ſuffered and roſe again.

XXXVIII. Hence we ſay, to Day, or to Morrow, or next Day, is the Paſſion or Reſurrection of our Lord; whereas the very Days in which thoſe things were done, are long paſt. So we ſay, the Lord is offered, when the Sacraments of his Paſſion are celebrated: Whereas he was but once offered in his own Perſon, for the Salvation of the World, as the Apoſtle ſaith, (a) *Chriſt hath ſuffered for us, leaving you an Example, that you ſhould follow his ſteps.* Not that Chriſt ſuffers every day in his own Perſon: This he did but once; but he hath left us an Example, which is every day preſented to the Faithful, in the Myſtery of the Lord's Body and Blood: So that whoſoever cometh thereunto, muſt underſtand that he ought to have a fellowſhip with him in his Sufferings, the Image whereof he ex-

(a) 1 Pet. 2. 21.

ſunt appoſita. (a) ſciens quia talia te oportet præparare. *Accedere ad Menſam Potentis, eſt divini participem libaminis fieri. Conſideratio vero appoſitorum Dominici Corporis & Sanguinis eſt intelligentia. Quibus quiſquis participat, advertat ſe talia debere præparare, ut ejus imitator exiſtat commoriendo cujus memoriam Mortis non ſolum credendo, verum etiam guſtando confitetur.*

XXXIX. *Item Beatus* Paulus *ad* Hebræos, Talis enim decebat, ut nobis eſſet Pontifex, ſanctus, innocens, impollutus, ſegregatus a peccatoribus, & excelſior cœlis factus; qui non habet neceſſitatem, quemadmodum Sacerdotes, quotidie hoſtias offerre prius pro ſuis delictis, deinde pro popu-

(a) *Sciens quia talia te oportet præparare*: Hic verba non extant in Bibl. Hebr. ſed in verſione 70. unde traducta, in nonnullis veteribus Latinis Bibliis lecta fuiſſe conſtat: Ab *Ambroſio* enim citantur, *De Officiis* l. 1. c. 31. Sed in Verſione Vulg. hodie non habentur.

li,

pects [to receive] in the Holy Myſteries; according to that of the Wiſe-man, (a) *If thou comeſt to the Table of a Great man, conſider diligently what is ſet before thee, (knowing that thou thy ſelf muſt prepare the like.)* To come to this Great-man's Table, is to be made a Partaker of the Divine Sacrifice: To conſider what is ſet before thee, is to underſtand the Lord's Body and Blood, of which whoſoever is partaker, ought to prepare the like, that is, to imitate him, by dying with him, whoſe Death he commemorates, not only in believing, but alſo in eating.

XXXIX. So St. *Paul* to the *Hebrews*, (a) *Such an High Prieſt became us who is holy, harmleſs, undefiled, ſeparate from ſinners, and made higher than the Heavens, who needeth not, as thoſe, daily to offer up Sacrifice, firſt for his own Sins, and then for the Peoples: For this the Lord Jeſus Chriſt did once, when he offered himſelf.* What he did once, he now every day repeats: For he once offered himſelf for the Sins of the People, yet the ſame Oblation is eve-

(a) Heb. 7. 26, 27.

(a) Prov. 23. 1, 2.

li ; hoc enim fecit ſemel ſe offerendo Dominus Jeſus Chriſtus. *Quod ſemel fecit, nunc quotidie frequentat ; ſemel enim pro peccatis populi ſe obtulit, celebratur tamen hæc eadem Oblatio ſingulis per fideles diebus, ſed in Myſterio, ut quod Dominus Jeſus Chriſtus ſemel ſe offerens adimplevit, hoc in ejus Paſſionis memoriam quotidie geratur per Myſteriorum celebrationem.*

XL. *Nec tamen falſo dicitur, quod in Myſteriis illis Dominus vel immoletur, vel patiatur : quoniam illius Mortis atque Paſſionis habent ſimilitudinem, quarum exiſtunt repræſentationes. Unde* Dominicum Corpus, *&* Sanguis Dominicus *appellantur, quoniam ejus ſumunt appellationem cujus exiſtunt Sacramentum.*

Iſid. *Orig.* lib. 6. c. 19. *Hinc Beatus* Iſidorus *in Libris* Etymologiarum, *ſic ait*, Sacrificium dictum quaſi ſacrum factum, quia prece myſtica conſecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ Paſſionis. Unde hoc eo jubente, Corpus Chriſti, & Sanguinem dicimus, quod dum fit ex Fructibus Terræ, ſanctificatur, & fit Sacramentum operante inviſibiliter Spiritu Dei. Cujus Panis & Calicis Sacramentum

ry day celebrated by the Faithful; but in a Myſtery: So that what the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, once offering himſelf, really did, the ſame is every day done in Remembrance of his Paſſion, by the Celebration of the Myſteries, or Sacraments.

XL. Nor yet is it falſly ſaid, That in thoſe Myſteries the Lord is offered, or ſuffereth; becauſe they have a Reſemblance of his Death and Paſſion, whereof they are Repreſentations; whereupon they are called *The Lord's Body*, and *the Lord's Blood*; becauſe they take the Names of thoſe things, whereof they are the Sacrament.

For this reaſon, St. *Iſidore*, in his Book of *Etymologies*, ſaith thus; *Sacrificium* (*the Sacrifice*) *is ſo called, from* Sacrum Factum, *a ſacred Action, becauſe it is conſecrated by myſtical Prayer, in Memory of the Lord's Paſſion for us: Whence by his Command, we call it the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which, though made of the Fruits of the Earth, is ſanctified and made a Sacrament by the inviſible Operation of the Spirit of God. Which Sacrament of the Bread and Cup, the* Greeks *call the* Euchariſt; *that is in Latine,* bona Gratia, *(good Grace.)*

cramentum Græci Εὐχαριστία dicunt, quod Latine † bona gratia interpretatur. Et quid melius ſanguine & Corpore Chriſti? * Panis vero & Vinum ideo Corpori & Sanguini || comparantur, quia ſicut hujus viſibilis Panis Vinique ſubſtantia exteriorem nutrit & inebriat hominem, ita Verbum Dei, qui eſt Panis vivus participatione ſui fidelium recreat mentes *.

XLI. *Et iſte Doctor Catholicus ſacrum illud Dominicæ Paſſionis Myſterium in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ Paſſionis docet agendum. Hoc dicens oſtendit, Dominicam Paſſionem ſemel eſſe factam, ejus vero memoriam in ſacris ſolennibus repræſentari.*

XLII. *Unde & Panis qui offertur, ex fructibus terræ cum ſit aſſumptus, in Chriſti Corpus, dum ſanctificatur, tranſ-*

† Frigidam hanc Etymologiam citat & *Gratianus, Decret.* l. 2. *Cauſa* 1. Quemadmodum & alia ejuſmodi, quæ oſtendunt *Iſidorum* non admodum Linguæ Græcæ peritum, *e. g. Metropolitani autem à menſura Civitatum vocantur*, Cril. l. 7. c. 12. Hæc citat *Gratianus*, Decr. l. 1. Diſt. 21. qu. 1. cap. *Cleros.*

* Clauſula inter Aſteriſcos duos poſita, non hodie legitur apud *Iſidorum*, vereor ne mala fide omiſſa ſit.

|| Impreſſi addunt *Domini.*

ponitur,

*And what is better than the Body and Blood of Christ? * Now Bread and Wine are therefore compared to the Body and Blood [of Christ] because as the Substance of this visible Bread and Wine, feed and inebriate the outward man; so the Word of God, which is the living Bread, doth refresh the Souls of the Faithful, by the receiving thereof *.*

XLI. Likewise this Catholick Doctor teaches, That the holy Mystery of the Lord's Passion should be celebrated in Remembrance of the Lord's Suffering for us. In saying whereof, he shews, that the Lord suffered but once; but the Memory of it is represented in sacred and solemn Rites.

XLII. So that the Bread which is offered, though made of the Fruits of the Earth, when Consecrated, is changed into Christ's Body; as also the Wine which flowed from the Vine, is by Sacramental Consecration made the Blood of Christ, not visibly

* These words which lie between two little Stars, are not in the Printed Editions of St. *Isidore*; I wish they were not purposely omitted by the Publishers of his Works, or rather expunged anciently by the Enemies of *Berengarius*.

indeed;

ponitur, ſicut & Vinum, cum ex vite defluxerit, divini tamen ſanctificatione Myſterii efficitur Sanguis Chriſti, non quidem viſibiliter, ſed ſicut ait præſens Doctor, operante inviſibiliter Spiritu (a) Dei.

XLIII. *Unde Sanguis & Corpus Chriſti dicuntur; quia non quod exterius videntur, ſed quod interius divino Spiritu operante facta ſunt, accipiuntur. Et quia longe aliud per potentiam inviſibilem exiſtunt, quam viſibiliter appareant, diſcernit, dum dicit, Panem & Vinum ideo Corpori & Sanguini Domini comparari*; quia ſicut viſibilis Panis & Vini ſubſtantia exteriorem nutrit & inebriat hominem, ita Verbum Dei, qui eſt Panis vivus, participatione ſui, Fidelium recreat mentes.

XLIV. *Iſta dicendo, planiſſime confitemur, quod in Sacramento Corporis & Sanguinis Domini, quicquid exterius ſumitur, ad corporis refectionem aptatur. Verbum autem Dei, qui eſt panis inviſibilis, inviſibiliter in illo exiſtens Sacramento, inviſibiliter participatione ſui Fidelium mentes vivificando paſcit.*

(a) In impreſſis *Spiritu Sancto.*

Hinc

indeed; but as this Doctor ſpeaks, by the inviſible Operation of the Spirit of God.

XLIII. And they are called the Blood and Body of Chriſt; becauſe they are underſtood to be, not what they outwardly appear; but what they are inwardly made by the inviſible Operation of the Holy Ghoſt. And that this inviſible Operation, renders them much a different thing, from what they appear to our Eyes, he (St. *Iſidore*) obſerves, when he ſaith, *That the Bread and Wine are therefore compared to the Lord's Body and Blood, becauſe, as the Subſtance of material Bread and Wine doth nouriſh the outward Man, ſo the Word of God, which is the Bread of Life, doth refreſh the Souls of the Faithful in partaking thereof.*

XLIV. In ſaying this, we moſt plainly confeſs, That in the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, whatſoever is outwardly received, ſerves only for the Refreſhment of the Body: But the Word of God, who is the inviſible Bread, being inviſibly in the Sacrament, doth in an inviſible manner nouriſh and quicken the Souls of the Faithful, by their partaking thereof.

XLV. Where-

XLV. Hinc etiam idem Doctor dicit, Sacramentum eſt in aliqua celebratione, cum res geſta ita ſit, ut aliquid ſignificare intelligatur quod ſancte accipiendum eſt: *Hæc dicendo oſtendit, (a) omne Sacramentum in divinis rebus aliquid ſecreti continere, & aliud eſſe quod viſibiliter appareat, aliud vero quod inviſibiliter ſit accipiendum.*

XLVI. Quæ ſunt autem Sacramenta fidelibus celebranda, conſequenter oſtendens ait: Sunt autem Sacramenta, Baptiſmus, & Chriſma, Corpus & Sanguis. (b) Quæ ob id Sacramenta dicuntur, quia ſub tegumento corporalium rerum, virtus divina ſecretius ſalutem eorundem Sacramentorum operatur. Unde & a ſecretis virtutibus, vel ſacris Sacramenta dicuntur: *Et in ſequentibus ait:* Græce Μυστήρια dicitur, quod ſecretam & reconditam habeat (c) diſpoſitionem.

XLVII. Quid iſtine perdocemur, niſi quod Corpus & Sanguis Domini propterea Myſteria dicuntur, quod ſecretam & reconditam habeant (d) diſpoſitionem. Id

---

(a) In impreſſis *confitetur.*
(b) Apud Iſidorum additur *Chriſti.*
(c) *Diſpenſationem,* ita libri impreſſi.
(d) *Diſpenſationem iterum.*

eſt,

XLV. Wherefore again the ſame Doctor ſaith, *There is a Sacrament in any divine Office, when the thing is ſo managed, that there is ſomewhat underſtood, which muſt be ſpiritually taken.* In ſaying thus, he ſhews, that every Sacrament or Myſtery of Religion, contains in it ſome ſecret thing. And that there is one thing that viſibly appears, and another thing to be Spiritually underſtood.

XLVI. And [ſoon after] ſhewing what are the Sacraments which the Faithful ſhould celebrate, he ſaith; *And theſe Sacraments are Baptiſm, Chriſm* [or Confirmation] *and the Body and Blood* [*of Chriſt.*] *Which are called Sacraments, becauſe under the Coverture of bodily things, the Power of God doth in a ſecret way work the Salvation* (or Grace) *conferred by them. And from theſe ſecret and ſacred Vertues, they are called* Sacraments. And in the following words, he ſaith, *It is called in* Greek Μυστήριον *a Myſtery, becauſe it contains a ſecret or hidden Diſpenſation.*

XLVII. What do we learn hence, but that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are therefore called Myſteries, becauſe they contain a ſecret and hidden Diſpenſation?

eſt, aliud ſint quod exterius innuant, aliud quod interius inviſibiliter operentur.

XLVIII. Hinc etiam & Sacramenta vocitantur, quia tegumento corporalium rerum, virtus divina ſecretius ſalutem accipientium fideliter diſpenſat.

XLIX. Ex his omnibus, quæ ſunt hactenus dicta, monſtratum eſt, quod Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti quæ fidelium ore in Eccleſia percipiuntur, figuræ ſunt ſe-ſecundum ſpeciem viſibilem. At vero ſecundum inviſibilem ſubſtantiam, id eſt, divini potentiam Verbi, vere Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti exiſtunt. Unde ſecundum viſibilem creaturam corpus paſcunt, juxta vero potentioris virtutem ſubſtantiæ, Fidelium mentes & paſcunt & ſanctificant.

L. Quæſtio

penſation? That is, it is one thing which they outwardly make Shew of, and another thing, which they operate inwardly and inviſibly.

XLVIII. And for this Reaſon they are called Sacraments, becauſe under the Covert of bodily Things, a divine Power doth ſecretly diſpenſe Salvation *(or Grace)* to them that faithfully receive them.

XLIX. By all that hath been hitherto ſaid, it appears, that the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are received by the Mouths of the Faithful in the Church, are Figures in reſpect of their viſible Nature; but in reſpect of the inviſible Subſtance, that is, the Power of the Word of God, they are truly Chriſt's Body and Blood. Wherefore as they are viſible Creatures, they feed the Body; but as they have the vertue of a more powerful Subſtance, they do both feed and ſanctifie the Souls of the Faithful.

L. Quæstio Secunda, *Jam nunc secundæ Quæstionis Propositum est inspiciendum & videndum: Utrum ipsum Corpus quod de* Maria *natum est, & passum, mortuum & sepultum, quodque ad dextram Patris consideat, sit quod ore Fidelium per Sacramentorum Mysterium in Ecclesia quotidie sumitur?*

LI. Percontemur quid ex hoc Sanctus Ambrosius *sentiat. Ait namque in* (a) *primo Sacramentorum Libro*; Revera mirabile est quod Manna Deus plueret Patribus, & quotidiano Cœli Pascebantur alimento; Unde dictum est, *Panem Angelorum manducavit Homo.* Sed tamen Panem illum qui manducaverunt omnes in deserto mortui sunt. Ista autem esca quam accipis, iste panis vivus qui descendit de Cœlo, vitæ æternæ substantiam subministrat, & quicunque hunc (b) manducaverit, non morietur in æternum, & Corpus Christi est.

LII. Vide secundum quod Doctor iste Corpus Christi dicat esse escam quam Fideles accipiunt in Ecclesia. Ait nam-

(a) Habentur hæc in Libro de initiandis, c. 8.
(b) *Hunc panem* in editis.

que,

L. We must now consider the Second Question, and see (*a*) whether that very Body which was born of *Mary*, which Suffered, was Dead and Buried, and which sits at the Right Hand of the Father, be the same which is daily received in the Church by the Mouths of the Faithful in the Sacramental Mysteries. The Second Question.

LI. Let us enquire what is the Judgment of St. *Ambrose* in this point: For he saith in his First Book of the Sacraments, *Truly, it is wonderful, that God rained down Manna to the Fathers, and they were fed every day with Heavenly Food; whereupon 'tis said, that Man did eat Angels Bread; and yet they who did eat that Bread, all died in the Wilderness: But that Food which thou receivest, that living Bread which came down from Heaven, ministers the Substance of Eternal Life, and whosoever eats thereof shall never die; and this is the Body of Christ.* He argues from a testimony of St. *Ambrose*

LII. See in what sense this Doctor saith, That the Body of Christ is that Food which the Faithful receive in

(*a*) Which *Paschasius Radbertus* affirms, and *Ratramnus* denies; as also did *Rabanus Maurus*, &c.

que, Iſte panis vivus qui de cœlo deſcendit, vitæ æternæ ſubſtantiam ſubminiſtrat. *Num ſecundum hoc quod videtur, quod corporaliter ſumitur, quod dente premitur, quod fauce glutitur, quod receptaculo ventris ſuſcipitur, æternæ vitæ ſubſtantiam ſubminiſtrat? Iſto namque modo carnem paſcit moriturâm, neque aliquam ſubminiſtrat incorruptionem; neque dici vere poteſt, Ut* quicunque hunc manducaverit non morietur in æternum. *Et hoc enim quod ſumit corpus, corruptibile eſt, nec ipſi corpori poteſt præſtare ne moriatur in æternum: Quoniam quod corruptioni ſubjacet, æternitatem præſtare non valet. Eſt ergo in illo pane vita, quæ non oculis apparet corporeis, ſed fidei contuetur aſpectu,* qui etiam panis vivus, qui deſcendit de cœlo exiſtit; *& de quo vere dicitur,* Quicunque hunc manducaverit, non morietur in æternum, & qui eſt Corpus (*a*) Chriſti.

LIII. Item in conſequentibus, cum de omnipotenti virtute Chriſti loqueretur, ſic ait; (*b*) Sermo ergo Chriſti, qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat, non poteſt ea quæ ſunt in id mutare (*c*) quæ non erant? Nonne

(*a*) Ibid. *c.* 9.
(*b*) In Impreſſis *Domini.*
(*c*) *Quod* in editis. (*a*) maius

the Church: For he ſaith, *That Living Bread which comes down from Heaven, miniſters the Subſtance of Eternal Life.* Doth it, as it is ſeen, as it is corporally received, chewed with the Teeth, as it is ſwallowed down the Throat, and received into the Belly, miniſter the Subſtance of Eternal Life? In this reſpect, it only feeds the Mortal Fleſh, it doth not miniſter Incorruption; nor can it be truly ſaid, That *whoſoever eats thereof, ſhall never die.* For what the Body receives, is corruptible, nor can it preſerve the Body, ſo that it ſhall never die; for what is it ſelf ſubject to corruption, cannot give Immortality. Therefore there is in that Bread a certain [Principle of] Life, which doth not appear to our bodily Eyes, but is ſeen by thoſe of Faith; "which "alſo is that Living Bread which "came down from Heaven; and concerning which it is truly ſaid, that *whoſoever eats thereof, ſhall never die*, and which is Chriſt's *Body*.

LIII. And afterwards ſpeaking of the Almighty Power of Chriſt, he ſaith thus: *Therefore the Word of Chriſt, which could produce things that were not, out of nothing, cannot it*

(a) majus est novas (b) res dare, quam mutare Naturas?

LIV. Dicit *Sanctus* Ambrosius, *In illo Mysterio Sanguinis & Corporis Christi commutationem esse factam, & mirabiliter, quia divine, & ineffabiliter, quia incomprehensibile.* Dicant qui nihil hic volunt *secundum interius latentem virtutem accipere, sed totum quod apparet visibiliter æstimare, secundum quid hic sit commutatio facta? Nam secundum Creaturarum substantiam, quod fuerunt ante consecrationem, hoc & postea consistunt. Panis & Vinum prius extitere, in qua etiam specie jam consecrata permanere videntur. Est ergo interius commutatum Spiritus Sancti potenti virtute, quod Fides aspicit, Animam pascit, æternæ vitæ substantiam submministrat.*

LV. Item in consequentibus, Quid hic quæris Naturæ ordinem in Christi corpore, cum præter Naturam sit ipse

(a) *Minus* in editis.
(b) *Rebus* in editis.

change the things that actually exiſt, into that which they were not? Is it not a greater Work to create things at firſt, than to alter their Natures?

LIV. St. *Ambroſe* ſaith, That in this Myſtery of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, there is a Change made, and wonderfully, becauſe it is Divine, Ineffable, and indeed Incomprehenſible; I deſire to know of them, who will by no means admit any thing of an inward ſecret Virtue, but will Judge of the whole matter, as it appears to outward Senſe, in what reſpect this Change is made. As for the ſubſtance of the Creatures, what they were before Conſecration, the ſame they remain after it. Bread and Wine they were before; and after Conſecration, we ſee they continue Beings of the ſame Nature and Kind: So that it is changed Internally, by the mighty Power of the Holy Ghoſt; and this is the mighty Object which Faith beholds, which feeds the Soul, and miniſters the ſubſtance of Eternal Life.

LV. And again it follows, *Why doſt thou here require the Order of Nature* [in the myſtery of] *Chriſt's Body, when our Lord God himſelf was, contrary to*

Dominus (a) Jesus partus ex Virgine?

*LVI. Hic jam surgit * Auditor & dicit, Corpus esse Christi quod cernitur, & Sanguinem qui bibitur; nec quærendum quomodo factum sit, sed tenendum quod sic factum sit. Bene quidem sentire videris, sed si vim verborum diligenter inspexeris, Corpus quidem Christi, Sanguinemque fideliter credis,† sed si perspiceres, quia quod credis nondum vides. Nam si videres, diceres*, Video; *non diceres*, Credo Corpus Sanguinemq; esse Christi. *Nunc autem quia Fides totum, quicquid illud totum est, aspicit, & oculus carnis nihil apprehendit, intellige quod non in specie, sed in virtute Corpus & Sanguis Christi existant, quæ cernuntur. Unde dicit, 'ordinem Na-'turæ non hic intuendum, sed Christi*

(a) *Deus Natus* in editis.

* *Auditor*. Fortassis per *Auditorem* intelligit *Catechumenum* rudem, & nondum plene dogmatis Evangelicis imbutum, vel Baptismati proximum. Qui *Auditores & Audientes* apud *Tert.* appellantur, *lib. De Pœnit. c. 6. inter Auditorum tyrocinia*. Et *Cyprianus Optatum* Lectorem Catechumenorum institutioni præpositum *Doctorem Audientium* à se constitutum dicit, *Ep.* 29. *Ed Ox.* 1682. Hoc unum obstat, quod apud *August. Hieron.* vel *Ambros.* in quorum Scriptis magis versatus videtur *Ratramnus* vocabulum *Auditor* nusquam, quod memini, ita acceptum occurrit. Sed res parvi est momenti.

† Redundat *sed si*.

'poten-

the Order of Nature, born of a Virgin?

LVI. Now perhaps, ſome one at the hearing of this, may ſtart up, and ſay, That it is the Body of Chriſt which we behold, and his Blood that we drink; yet we muſt not enquire how it becomes ſo; but only believe ſtedfaſtly that it is ſo. Thou ſeemeſt to think aright; but yet if thou didſt carefully obſerve the Importance of thy Words, when thou ſayeſt, That thou faithfully believeſt it to be the Body and Blood of Chriſt, thou would'ſt underſtand, that what thou believeſt thou doſt not ſee: For if thou ſaweſt it, thou would'ſt ſay, *I ſee*, and not *I believe, that it is the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* Whereas now, becauſe Faith diſcerns the whole matter, whatever it is, and the Bodily Eye perceives nothing of it, thou muſt underſtand, that thoſe things which are ſeen, are the Body and Blood of Chriſt, not in Kind, or Nature, but Virtually. For which Reaſon, he ſaith, *That the Order of Nature is not to be conſidered; but the Power of Chriſt muſt be adored, which changes what he will, how he will, into what he will; creating what had no Being, and changing the Creature into*

An Objection obviated.

'potentiam venerandam, quæ ‖ quic-
'quid vult, * quomodo vult, in quod-
'cunque vult, & creat quod non erat, &
'creatum permutat in id quod antea non
'fuerat. Subjungit idem Author. Vera utique Caro quæ crucifixa est, quæ sepulta est, † vere ergo Carnis illius Sacramentum est. Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus, Hoc est Corpus meum.

LVII. Quam diligenter, quam prudenter facta distinctio! De Carne Christi quæ crucifixa est, quæ sepulta est, id est, secundum quam Christus crucifixus & sepultus est, ait, Vera itaque Caro *Christi. At de illa quæ sumitur in Sacramento, dicit; Vere* ergo Carnis illius Sacramentum est, *distinguens* Sacramentum *Carnis, a* Veritate *Carnis; quatenus in veritate Carnis quam sumpserat de Virgine diceret eum crucifixum & sepultum; quod vero nunc agitur in Ecclesia, Mysterium vera illius Carnis in qua crucifixus diceret esse Sacramentum; patenter Fideles instituens, quod illa Caro secundum quam & crucifixus est Christus, & sepultus, non sit Mysterium, sed Veritas Naturæ; hac*

‖ Deest *permutat.*

* *Quomodo vult* desideratur in excuss.

† *Veræ* legisse videtur *Ratramnus*, nec praeter mentem S. *Ambrosii.*

vero

what it was not before. And the ſame Author adds; *Doubtleſs it was the true Fleſh* [*of Chriſt,*] *which was Crucified and Buried*; (a) *therefore this is really the Sacrament of that Fleſh. The Lord Jeſus himſelf ſaith, This is my Body.*

LVII. How warily, and wiſely doth he diſtinguiſh! Speaking of the Fleſh of Chriſt, which was Crucified and Buried, or in which Chriſt was Crucified and Buried, he ſaith, *It is the true Fleſh of Chriſt:* But of that which is taken in the Sacrament, he ſaith, *It's therefore truly the Sacrament of that* Fleſh, diſtinguiſhing between the *Sacrament* of his Fleſh, and the *Verity* of his Fleſh, [or his true Fleſh] in as much as he ſaith, in that true Fleſh which he took of the Virgin, he was Crucified and Buried; whereas he ſaith, the Myſtery now celebrated in the Church, is the Sacrament of that true Fleſh in which he was Crucified; expreſly teaching the Faithful, that that Fleſh in which Chriſt was Crucified and Buried, is not a Myſtery, but true and natural; whereas that Fleſh which myſtically Another Argument from St. *Ambroſe.*

(a) *Or it may be rendred,* The Sacrament of that true Fleſh.

repre-

vero Caro quæ nunc similitudinem illius in Myſterio continet, non ſit Specie *Caro, ſed* Sacramento. *Siquidem in ſpecie panis eſt, in Sacramento, verum Chriſti Corpus, ſicut ipſe clamat Dominus Jeſus,* Hoc eſt Corpus meum.

LVIII. *Item in conſequentibus,*† Quid comedamus, quid bibamus, alibi tibi per Prophetam Spiritus Sanctus expreſſit, dicens, Guſtate & videte quoniam ſuavis eſt Dominus; Beatus vir qui ſperat in eo. *Num corporaliter guſtatus ille panis, aut illud vinum bibitum, oſtendit quam ſit* ſuavis Dominus? *Quicquid enim ſapit, corporale eſt, & fauces delectat. Numquid Dominum guſtare corporeum eſt aliquid ſentire? Invitat ergo ſpiritualis* * *guſtet ſaporem experiri, & in illo vel potu vel pane nihil corporaliter opinari, ſed totum ſpiritualiter ſentire: quoniam* Dominus Spiritus eſt, & beatus vir qui ſperat in eo.

LIX. *Item conſequenter,* In illo Sacramento Chriſtus eſt, quia corpus Chriſti eſt: Non ergo corporalis Eſca, ſed ſpiritualis eſt. *Quid aper-*

† *Ambroſ.* ibid. In impreſſis legitur *quid edamus.*

* Rectius *guſtus* in impreſſis.

tius?

repreſents the former, is not Fleſh *in kind, or Naturally*, but *Sacramentally*: For in its Kind, or Nature, it is Bread; but Sacramentally, it is the true Body of Chriſt, as the Lord Jeſus ſaith, *This is my Body*.

LVIII. And in the following words, *The Holy Ghoſt hath in another place by the Prophet declared to thee what it is that we eat and drink, ſaying*, * Taſte, and ſee, that the Lord is good; bleſſed is the man that truſteth in him. Doth the Bread and Wine, eaten and drunk, corporally ſhew *how ſweet the Lord is*? Whatſoever is an Object of Taſting, is corporeal, and delights the Palate. What? Is to taſte the Lord, to perceive any Corporeal Object? Wherefore he invites them to make Tryal by their Spiritual Faculty of Taſting; and not think of any thing Corporeal, either in that Drink or Bread; but to underſtand every thing Spiritually: For *the Lord is a Spirit, and bleſſed is the Man that truſteth in him*.

LIX. And afterwards, *Chriſt is in the Sacrament, becauſe it is the Body of Chriſt; yet it is not therefore Bodily Food, but Spiritual*. What could be

* Pſal. 34. 8.

more

tius? Quid manifestius? Quid divinius? Ait enim in illo Sacramento Christus est. Non enim ait, ille Panis, & illud Vinum Christus est, quod si diceret Christum corruptibilem (quod absit) & mortalitati subjectum prædicaret: Quicquid enim in illa esca vel cernitur vel gustatur corporaliter, corruptibilitati constat obnoxium esse.

LX. Addit, Quia Corpus Christi est. *Insurgis & dicis, Ecce manifeste illum Panem, & illum Potum Corpus esse Christi confitetur; Sed attende quem admodum * subjungit.* Non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritualis est. *Non igitur sensum carnis adhibeas; nihil enim secundum eum hic decernitur. Est quidem Corpus Christi, sed non corporale, sed spirituale. Est Sanguis Christi, sed non corporalis, sed spiritualis. Nihil igitur hic corporaliter, sed spiritualiter sentiendum. Corpus Christi est, sed non corporaliter; & Sanguis Christi est, sed non corporaliter.*

LXI. Item consequenter, "*Unde &* "*Apostolus hic (inquit) de Typo ejus*

* In impressis *Subjungitur.*

"*ait,*

more plainly, clearly, and more divinely ſaid: For he ſaith, in that Sacrament Chriſt is; but he doth not ſay, that Bread, and that Wine is Chriſt; which ſhould he have ſaid, he would have made Chriſt corruptible and mortal; which God forbid he ſhould: For it is certain, that whatſoever is corporeally ſeen, or taſted in that Food, is liable to corruption.

LX. He adds, *Becauſe it is Chriſt's Body.* You will reply upon me; Look here, he plainly acknowledges this Bread and Wine to be Chriſt's Body. But have patience, and mark what he ſubjoyns; *Yet this is not bodily Food, but ſpiritual.* Uſe not therefore thy bodily Senſe; for it is no Judge in this Matter. It is the Body of Chriſt indeed, yet not Corporal, but Spiritual. It is the Blood of Chriſt, yet not Corporal, but Spiritual: So that nothing is here to be underſtood Corporally, but Spiritually. It is the Body of Chriſt, but not Corporally: It is the Blood of Chriſt, but not Corporally.

LXI. And afterwards, "Where-"fore the Apoſtle (ſaith he) ſpeak-"ing

" *ait*, Quia Patres noſtri eſcam ſpi-
" ritualem manducaverunt, & potum
" ſpiritualem biberunt; *Corpus enim*
" *Dei*, † *ſpirituale eſt*; *Corpus Chri-*
" *ſti*, *Corpus eſt Divini Spiritus*; *quia*
" *Spiritus Chriſtus eſt*, *ut legimus* * *in*
" Threnis. *Spiritus ante faciem no-*
" *ſtram Chriſtus Dominus.*

LXII. Luculentiſſime Sanguinis & Corporis Chriſti Myſterium, quemadmodum debeamus intelligere, docuit. Cum enim dixiſſet Patres noſtros eſcam ſpiritualem manducaſſe, & potum ſpiritualem bibiſſe; *cum tamen Manna illud quod comederunt, & aquam quam biberunt, corporea fuiſſe, nemo* || *quis dubitet, adjungit de Myſterio quod in Eccleſia nunc agitur, definiens ſecundum quid Corpus ſit Chriſti.* Corpus enim Dei, *inquiens*, Corpus eſt ſpirituale. *Deus utique Chriſtus, & Corpus quod ſumpſit de* Maria *Virgine, quod paſſum, quod ſepultum eſt, quod reſurrexit, Corpus utique verum fuit,* † *id eſt quod viſibile atque palpabile manebat. At vero*

† In impreſſis, *Corpus ſpirituale.*
* In editis deeſt *in Threnis.*
|| In MS. *eſt* deſideratur.
† Codd. impreſſi legunt *idem.*

Corpus,

" ing of the Type thereof, ſaith, " *That our Fathers did eat Spiritual* " *Meat, and drank Spiritual Drink.* " For the Body of God is Spiritual. " The Body of Chriſt is the Body of " a Divine Spirit, as we read in the " *Lamentations*, * *Chriſt the Lord, is the Spirit before our Face.*

LXII. He very clearly teaches, how we are to underſtand the Myſtery of Chriſt's Body and Blood: For having ſaid, our Fathers did eat Spiritual Meat, and drank Spiritual Drink; when no body doubts that the Manna which they did eat, and the Water which they drank, were Corporeal; He adds, concerning the Myſtery which we now celebrate in the Church, determining in what Senſe it is Chriſt's Body: *For the Body of God is a Spiritual Body.* Verily Chriſt is God; and the Body which he took of the Virgin *Mary*, which Suffered, was Buried, and Roſe a-

* The Place St. *Ambroſe* cites, is *Lam.* 4. 20. where the LXX read πνευμα προσωπου ἡμων χριστος κυριος; and the vulgar Latine, *Chriſtus Dominus*; but our Engliſh Tranſlation renders it truly, *The Lord's Anointed*: By which Expoſitors underſtand not Jeſus Chriſt; but either *Joſiah*, or as ſome think, *Zedekiah*.

gain,

Corpus, quod Myſterium Dei dicitur, non eſt corporale, ſed ſpirituale. Quod ſi ſpirituale, jam non viſibile, neque palpabile. Hinc Beatus Ambroſius *ſubjungit,* Corpus, *inquiens, Chriſti* Corpus eſt divini Spiritus: *Divinus autem Spiritus nihil corporeum, nihil corruptibile, nihil palpabile quod ſit exiſtit. At hoc Corpus quod in Eccleſia celebratur, ſecundum viſibilem ſpeciem, & corruptibile eſt, & palpabile.*

LXIII. Quomodo ergo divini Spiritus Corpus eſſe dicitur? Secundum hoc utique quod ſpirituale eſt, id eſt, ſecundum quod inviſibile conſiſtit, & impalpabile, ac per hoc incorruptibile.

LXIV. Hinc in conſequentibus, Quia Spiritus Chriſtus, ut legimus, Spiritus ante faciem noſtram Chriſtus Dominus. *Patenter oſtendit ſecundum quod habeatur Corpus Chriſti, videlicet ſecundum id quod ſit in eo Spiritus Chriſti, id eſt, divini potentia Verbi, quæ non ſolum Animam paſcit, verum etiam purgat.*

LXV. Prop-

gain, was his true Body, that is, it remained ſuch as might be ſeen and felt; but the Body, which is called the Myſtery of God, is not Corporeal, but Spiritual; and if Spiritual, then it can neither be ſeen, nor yet felt. And for this reaſon St. *Ambroſe* proceeds to ſay, *The Body of Chriſt is the Body of a Divine Spirit.* Now, a Divine Spirit is no Corporeal, Corruptible, or palpable Being: But that Body which is celebrated in the Church, according to its viſible Nature, is both Corruptible, and ſuch as may be felt.

LXIII. In what reſpect then is it called the Body of a Divine Spirit? Truly, as it is Spiritual, that is, as it is inviſible; as it cannot be felt, and is therefore incorruptible.

LXIV. Which makes him further add, That Chriſt is a Spirit; as we read, *Chriſt, the Lord, is the Spirit before our Face.* Whereby he plainly ſhews, in what reſpect it is accounted Chriſt's Body, to wit, in as much as the Spirit of Chriſt is therein, that is to ſay, the Power of the Divine Word, which doth not only feed, but alſo purifies the Soul.

LXV. Propter quod ipſe dicit Author conſequenter, Denique cor noſtrum eſca iſta confirmat, & potus iſte lætificat cor hominis; ut Propheta (*a*) commemoravit. *Num eſca corporalis cor hominis confirmat, & potus corporeus lætificat cor hominis? Sed ut oſtenderet quæ eſca, vel qui potus ſint de quibus loquitur, addidit ſignanter* Eſca iſta, vel potus iſte: *Quæ iſta, vel qui iſte? Corpus nimirum Chriſti, Corpus Divini Spiritus; & ut apertius inculcetur, Spiritus Chriſtus, de quo* (*b*) *loquitur*, Spiritus ante faciem noſtram Chriſtus Dominus. *Quibus omnibus evidenter oſtenditur, nihil in eſca iſta, nihil in potu iſto corporaliter ſentiendum, ſed totum ſpiritualiter attendendum.*

LXVI. Non enim Anima, quæ corde hominis præſenti loco ſignificatur, vel eſca corporea, vel potu corporeo paſcitur, ſed Verbo Dei nutritur & vegetatur; quod apertius in Libro quinto Sacramentorum, Doctor idem affirmat. (*c*) Non iſte panis eſt, *inquiens*, qui vadit in corpus, ſed ille panis vitæ æter-

(*a*) *Memoravit* in editis. (*b*) Codd. alii *Legitur*. (*c*) *Ambr.* lib. *Sacr.* 5. c. 4.

næ,

LXV. Wherefore our Author goes on: *Lastly this Meat ſtrengtheneth our Heart, and this Drink maketh glad the Heart of Man, as the* (*b*) *Prophet teſtifies.* Now doth our Bodily Food ſtrengthen, or doth this Bodily Drink make glad the Heart of Man? But to ſhew of what Meat and Drink it is that he ſpeaks, he adds emphatically: *This Meat, and this Drink.* What is this Meat, and this Drink? Even the Body of Chriſt, the Body of the Divine Spirit; and (to explain the Matter yet more) Chriſt himſelf, who is a Spirit, of whom he ſaith, *Chriſt, the Lord, is the Spirit before our Face.* By all which Diſcourſe, it evidently appears, that in this Meat and Drink, nothing is to be corporally underſtood; but all muſt be Spiritually taken.

LXVI. For the Soul, which is in this place ſignified by the Heart of Man, is not fed with bodily Meat, or Drink; but is nouriſhed by the Word of God, and grows thereby. Which the ſame Doctor doth more expreſly affirm in his Fifth Book upon the Sacraments, ſaying, *It is not that Bread which goes into the Body,*

(*b*) Pſal. 104. 15.

næ, qui animæ noſtræ ſubſtantiam (c) ſubminiſtrat.

LXVII. Et quia non de communi pane dixerit hoc Sanctus Ambroſius, *verum de pane Corporis Chriſti, ſequentia Lectionis manifeſtiſſime declarant. Loquitur enim de pane quotidiano, quem Credentes ſibi poſtulant dari.*

LXVIII. Et idcirco ſubjungit, Si quotidianus eſt panis, cur poſt annum illum ſumis, quemadmodum Græci in Oriente facere conſueverunt? Accipe (d) ergo quotidie quod quotidie tibi proſit, ſic vive ut quotidie mereari accipere. *Ergo manifeſtum eſt de quo pane loquitur, de pane (videlicet) Corporis Chriſti, qui non ex eo quod vadit in Corpus, ſed ex eo quod panis ſit vitæ æternæ animæ noſtræ ſubſtantiam fulcit.*

LXIX. Hujus doctiſſimi Viri authoritate perdocemur, quod multa differentia ſeparantur, Corpus in quo paſſus eſt Chriſtus, & Sanguis quem pendens in cruce, de latere ſuo profudit, & hoc Corpus quod in Myſterio Paſſionis Chriſti quotidie a fidelibus celebratur, & ille quoque Sanguis qui fidelium ore ſu-

(c) *Fulcit* in editis. Cujus loco memoriæ lapſu Librarius videtur *ſubminiſtrat* ſcripſiſſe; nam *Ratramnum* etiam perinde ac nos *fulcit*, legiſſe liquet ex clauſula Paragraphi ſequentis. (d) *Ergo* non legitur in impreſſis.

mitur

but the Bread of Life Eternal, which affords Sustenance to our Souls.

LXVII. And that St. *Ambrose* spake not this of common Bread; but of that Bread which is also Christ's Body, is most manifest from the following Passages: For he speaks of the Daily Bread, which the Faithful pray for.

LXVIII. Adding, If it be *Daily Bread, why dost thou receive it but once in the Year, as the* Greeks *in the East were wont to do? Receive that every Day, which may every Day do thee good; and live so, that thou mayest be every Day worthy to receive.* So that it is plain of what Bread he speaks, to wit, of the Bread of Christ's Body, which sustains our Souls, not as it passes into our Bodies, but as it is the Bread of Eternal Life.

He Sums up the force of St. *Ambr.* his Discourse.

LXIX. By the Authority of this most Learned Father, we are taught how vast a difference there is, between the Body, in which Christ suffered, and the Blood which he shed out of his Side, as he hung on the Cross, and that Body which is daily celebrated by the Faithful, in the Mystery of his Passion; and that

mitur, ut Myſterium ſit illius ſanguinis quo totus redemptus eſt Mundus. Iſte namque panis & iſte potus non ſecundum quod videntur corpus ſive ſanguis exiſtunt Chriſti, ſed ſecundum quod ſpiritualiter vitæ ſubſtantiam ſubminiſtrant. Illud vero corpus in quo ſemel paſſus eſt Chriſtus, non aliam ſpeciem præferebat quam in qua conſiſtebat. Hoc enim erat, quod vere videbatur, quod tangebatur, quod crucifigebatur, quod ſepeliebatur. Similiter Sanguis illius de latere manans, non aliud apparebat exterius, & aliud interius obvelabat: Verus itaque ſanguis de vero corpore profluebat: At nunc Sanguis Chriſti, quem Credentes ebibunt, & Corpus quod comedunt aliud ſunt in ſpecie, & aliud in ſignificatione. *Aliud quod paſcunt Corpus eſca corporea, & aliud quod ſaginant Mentes æternæ vitæ ſubſtantia.*

LXX. De qua re (a) Beatus Hieronymus *in Commentario Epiſt.* Pauli *ad* Epheſios, *ita ſcribit:* Dupliciter

(a) *Hieron.* in Ep. ad *Epheſ.* c. 1.

San-

Blood, which is received with their Mouths, as the Sacrament of that Blood wherewith the whole World was Redeemed. For that Bread and Drink, are not the Body and Blood of Chriſt, as they are viſible; but as they Spiritually miniſter the Suſtenance of Life. Moreover, that Body, in which Chriſt once ſuffered, appeared to be no other thing than really it was; for ſuch it really was as it appeared to the eye, to the touch, the ſame thing which was Crucified and Buried. Likewiſe the Blood iſſuing from his Side, did not outwardly appear one thing, and inwardly contain another: So that true Blood flowed from his true Side. But now the Blood of Chriſt, which the Faithful drink, and that Body which they eat, *are one thing in their Nature, and another in their Signification*; one thing, as they feed the Body, Bodily Food; and another thing, as they feed the Soul, *viz.* the Suſtenance of Eternal Life.

LXX. Of which matter *St. Hierom* in his Comment on St. *Paul*'s Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, writes thus: *The* St. *Hierom* on the *Epheſ.* c. 1.

Sanguis Christi, & Caro intelligitur; (b) vel spiritualis illa, atque divina, de qua ipse dicit, Caro mea vere est cibus, & Sanguis meus vere est potus; vel (c) Caro quæ crucifixa est, & Sanguis qui militis effusus est lancea.

LXXI. Non parva Doctor iste differentia Corporis & Sanguinis Christi fecit distinctionem. Namque dum Carnem vel Sanguinem quæ quotidie sumuntur a fidelibus, spiritualia dicit esse; at vero Caro quæ crucifixa est, & Sanguis qui Militis effusus est Lancea, non spiritualia esse dicuntur, neque divina; patenter insinuat, quod tantum inter se differunt, quantum differunt corporalia & spiritualia, visibilia & invisibilia, divina atque humana; (d) at quod a se differunt, non idem sunt. Differunt autem Caro spiritualis, quæ fidelium ore sumitur, & Sanguis spiritualis, qui quotidie Credentibus potandus exhibetur, a

(b) Deest *vel* in impressis.
(c) *Vel Caro & Sanguis quæ crucifixa est, & qui Militis effusus est Lancea.*
(d) Rectius impressi *at quæ.*

Carne

Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt is taken in two Senſes; in the one, it is that Spiritual and Divine, of which he ſaith, My Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed.—— In the other, it is that Fleſh which was Crucified, and that Blood which was let out by the Soldier's Spear.

LXXI. This Doctor diſtinguiſhes, and makes no ſmall difference between the two acceptations of Chriſts Body and Blood. For whilſt he ſtiles that Body and Blood of Chriſt, Spiritual, which is daily received by the Faithful; and that Fleſh which was Crucified, and that Blood which was let out by the Soldier's Spear, is not ſaid to be either Spiritual, or Divine; he manifeſtly inſinuates, that theſe differ from each other, as much as Corporeal and Spiritual, Viſible and Inviſible, Humane and Divine: Now things that differ, are not the ſame. And in the Opinion of this Author, [*viz.* St. *Hierom*] That Spiritual Fleſh which the Faithful receive with their Mouths, and that Spiritual Blood, which is daily given to Believers to drink, differ from that Fleſh which was Crucified, and

Chriſt's Body is taken in two Senſes.

Carne quæ crucifixa est, & Sanguine qui Militis effusus est Lanceæ, sicut auctoritas præsentis Viri testificatur : Non igitur idem sunt.

LXXII. Illa namque Caro quæ crucifixa est, de Virginis carne facta est, ossibus & nervis compacta, & humanorum Membrorum lineamentis distincta, rationalis animæ spiritu vivificata in propriam vitam & congruentes motus. At vero Caro spiritualis, quæ populum credentem spiritualiter pascit, secundum speciem quam gerit exterius, Frumenti granis manu Artificis consistit, nullis nervis ossibusque compacta, nulla Membrorum varietate distincta, nulla rationali substantia vegetata, nullos proprios motus potens exercere. Quicquid enim in ea vitæ præbet substantiam, spiritualis est potentiæ, & invisibilis efficientiæ, divinæq; virtutis. Atq; aliud longe consistit, secundum quod exterius conspicitur, atque (a) aliud secundum quod in Mysterio creditur. Porro Caro Christi quæ crucifixa est, non aliud exterius, quam quod interius erat, ostendebat ; quia vera Caro veri hominis existebat, Corpus utique verum in veri Corporis specie consistens.

(a) Impressi legunt *illud.*

LXXIII. Con-

and that Blood which was let out by the Souldier's Spear: Therefore they are not the ſame.

LXXII. For that Fleſh which was crucified, was made of the Virgin's Fleſh, conſiſting of Bones and Nerves, diſtinguiſh'd by its Lineaments, into ſeveral Members of a humane Body, animated with a reaſonable Soul, having proper Life, and agreeable Motions. But that Spiritual Body, which ſpiritually feeds the faithful People, as to its external Nature, is made of ſeveral Grains of Wheat, by the Baker's hand, hath neither Sinews nor Bones, nor diſtinction of Members, nor is it animated by any reaſonable Subſtance, nor can it exerciſe any vital Motion. But that, whatever it is which gives the Subſtance of Life, is the Efficacy of a ſpiritual Power, of an inviſible and divine Virtue. And that which appears outwardly, is quite another thing, than that which is believed in the Myſtery. Moreover, the Fleſh of Chriſt which was crucified, did not outwardly appear any other thing, than what inwardly it was. For it was the true Fleſh of a true Man; a true Body in the ſhape of a true Body.

He ſheweth the Difference of his Natural and Spiritual Body.

LXXIII. It

LXXIII. Considerandum quoque quod in Pane illo non ſolum Corpus Chriſti, verum etiam in eum credentis populi figuretur, unde multis Frumenti granis conficitur: quia Corpus Populi credentis multis per Verbum Chriſti fidelibus (a) augmentatur.

LXXIV. Qua de re, ſicut in Myſterio, Panis ille Chriſti Corpus accipitur, ſic etiam in Myſterio, Membra Populi credentis in Chriſtum intimantur, & ſicut non corporaliter, ſed ſpiritualiter, Panis ille Credentium Corpus dicitur; ſic quoque Chriſti Corpus non corporaliter, ſed ſpiritualiter neceſſe eſt intelligatur.

LXXV. Sic & in Vino, quæ Sanguis Chriſti dicitur, Aqua miſceri jubetur, nec unum ſine altero permittitur offerri: Quia nec Populus ſine Chriſto, nec Chriſtus ſine Populo, ſicut nec Caput ſine Corpore, vel Corpus ſine Capite valet exiſtere. Aqua denique in illo Sacramento populi geſtat imaginem. Igitur ſi Vinum illud ſanctificatum per Miniſtrorum Officium in Chriſti Sanguinem corporaliter convertitur, Aqua quoque quæ pariter admixta eſt, in Sanguinem Po-

(a) Forte *coagmentatur.*

puli

LXXIII. It is further to be considered, That in that Bread, not only the Body of Christ, but also the Body of the People believing in him, is figured; and therefore it is made of many grains of Wheat, as the Body of faithful People is made up of many Believers by the Word of Christ. *The Sacramental Bread a figure of the People, as well as of Christ's Body.*

LXXIV. For which reason, as in the Sacrament, that Bread is understood to be Christ's Body; so in the same Sacrament, his Members, the People that believe in Christ, are also signified. And as that Bread is said to be the Body of the Faithful, not corporally, but spiritually; so must it necessarily be understood to be the Body of Christ, not corporally, but spiritually.

LXXV. So with the Wine, which is called Christ's Blood, (*a*) Water is commanded to be mixt; nor is one allowed to be offered without the other; because neither is the People without Christ, nor Christ without the People: As the Head cannot be without the Body, nor the Body with- *As is also the Water mixt with the Wine.*

(*a*) Both the *Greek* and *Latine* Church used to mix Water with Wine in the *Eucharist*, but held it not essential to the Sacrament.

out

puli credentis, neceſſe eſt corporaliter convertatur. Ubi namque una Sanctificatio eſt, una conſequenter Operatio; & ubi par Ratio, par quoque conſequitur Myſterium. At videmus in Aqua ſecundum Corpus, nihil eſſe converſum, conſequenter ergo & in Vino nihil corporaliter oſtenſum. Accipitur ſpiritualiter quicquid in Aqua de Populi Corpore ſignificatur; accipiatur ergo neceſſe eſt ſpiritualiter quicquid in Vino de Chriſti Sanguine intimatur.

LXXVI. Item quæ a ſe differunt, idem non ſunt: Corpus Chriſti quod mortuum eſt, & reſurrexit, & immortale factum, jam non moritur, & Mors illi ultra non dominabitur; *æternum eſt, nec jam paſſibile, Hoc autem quod in Eccleſia celebratur, temporale eſt, non æternum; corruptibile eſt, non incorruptum; in via eſt, non in Patria. Differunt igitur a ſe, quapropter non ſunt idem. (a)* [*Quod ſi non ſunt idem*]

(a) Hæc librarii incuria ex MS. *Lobienſi excidiſſe videntur.*

quomodo

out the Head. Laſtly, Water in that Sacrament, repreſents the People. Now if the Wine conſecrated by the Miniſter's Office, were corporally changed into Chriſt's Blood, the Water alſo which is mixed therewith, muſt neceſſarily be corporally changed into the Blood of the faithful People: For where there is but one Conſecration, there is conſequently but one Operation; and where there is the like Reaſon, there is the like Myſtery. But we ſee no corporeal Change in the Water, neither is there any corporeal Change in the Wine. The Repreſentation of the Body of the People in the Water, is altogether ſpiritual; therefore the Repreſentation of the Blood of Chriſt in the Wine, muſt alſo of neceſſity be altogether ſpiritual.

LXXVI. Again, Things that differ from each other, are not the ſame. The Body of Chriſt that died, and roſe again, and being made immortal, * *dieth no more, nor hath Death any more Dominion over it*; is eternal now, and no longer paſſible. But that which is celebrated in the Church, is temporal, not eternal; cor-

The Sacrament not incorruptible, therefore not Chriſt's natural Body.

*Rom.6.6.

quomodo verum Corpus Chriſti dicitur, & verus Sanguis?

LXXVII. Si enim Corpus Chriſti eſt, & hoc dicitur vere quia Corpus Chriſti eſt; in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt: & ſi in veritate Corpus Chriſti, & Corpus Chriſti incorruptibile eſt, & impaſſibile eſt, ac per hoc æternum. Hoc igitur Corpus Chriſti quod agitur in Eccleſia, neceſſe eſt ut incorruptibile ſit & æternum. Sed negari non poteſt corrumpi, quod per partes (b) comminutum diſpartitur ad ſumendum, & dentibus commolitum in Corpus trajicitur. Sed aliud eſt quod exterius geritur, aliud vero quod per fidem creditur. Ad ſenſum quod pertinet Corporis, corruptibile eſt, quod Fides vero credit, incorruptibile. Exterius igitur quod apparet, non eſt ipſa res, ſed Imago rei; mente vero quod ſentitur & intelligitur veritas rei.

(b) *Commutatum* male in impreſſis.

LXXVIII. Hinc

corruptible, not exempt from Corruption; in our Way, not in our [*heavenly*] Country. Therefore they differ, and are not the ſame. And if they are not the ſame, how are they ſaid to be the *true Body*, and *true Blood* of Chriſt.

LXXVII. For if it be Chriſt's Body, if it be truly ſaid, that it is Chriſt's Body, then it is Chriſt's Body in verity [of Nature;] and if ſo, then it is incorruptible, impaſſible, and by conſequence, eternal. And therefore this Body of Chriſt, which is celebrated in the Church, muſt neceſſarily be incorruptible and eternal. Now it cannot be denied, but that thing is corrupted which is broken into pieces, and diſtributed piece-meal to be received, and being ground by the Teeth, paſſeth into the Body. But it is one thing, that is outwardly done, and another that is received by Faith. That which our bodily Senſe perceives, is corruptible; that which Faith believes, is incorruptible. Wherefore that which outwardly appears, is not the thing it ſelf, but the Image of it; but that which the Mind perceives and underſtands, is the very thing it ſelf.

LXXVIII. Hinc (a) *Beatus* Auguſtin. in *Evangelii* Joannis *expoſitione, dum de Corpore Chriſti loqueretur & Sanguine, ſic ait*; Manducavit & *Moſes* Manna, manducavit & *Aaron*, manducavit & *Phinees*, manducaverunt ibi multi qui Deo placuerunt, & mortui (b) ſunt. Quare? Quia viſibilem cibum ſpiritualiter intellexerunt, ſpiritualiter eſurierunt, ſpiritualiter guſtaverunt, ut ſpiritualiter ſatiarentur. Nam & nos hodie accipimus viſibilem cibum, ſed aliud eſt Sacramentum, aliud virtus Sacramenti. *Item in poſteribus*, Hic eſt panis qui de cœlo deſcendit. Hunc panem ſignificavit Manna, hunc panem ſignificavit Altare Dei. Sacramenta illa fuerunt, in ſignis diverſa, (c) in re quæ ſignificatur paria ſunt. Apoſtolum *Paulum* audi, Nolovos ignorare, Fratres, quia Patres noſtri omnes ſub Nube fuerunt, (d) [& omnes Mare tranſierunt, & omnes in *Moſe* Baptizati ſunt in Nube & in Mari,] &

(a) *Aug.* in 7o. Tract. 26. (b) In impreſſione tui non ſunt. (c) In editis *diverſa ſunt.* (d) Verba unculis incluſa deſiderantur in MS. Lab.

omnes

LXXVIII. Whereupon St. *Auguſtine*, in his Expoſition of St. *John*'s Goſpel, ſpeaking of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, ſaith thus; Moſes *did eat Manna, and both* Aaron *and* Phineas *did eat, and many others who pleaſed God, and died, did eat thereof. How ſo? Becauſe they did ſpiritually underſtand their viſible Food, they did hunger ſpiritually, and taſte ſpiritually, and were ſpiritually filled. And we at this day receive viſible Food; but the Sacrament is one thing, and the vertue of the Sacrament is another.* And afterwards; *This is the Bread that cometh down from Heaven. The Manna ſignified this Bread; the Altar of God ſignified the ſame. Theſe were Sacraments differing in the Signs, but agreeing in the thing ſignified.* Hear what St. *Paul* ſaith, (a) *Brethren, I would not have you ignorant, that our Fathers were all under the Cloud, and all paſſed through the Sea, and were all baptized into* Moſes *in the Cloud, and in the Sea; and did all eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat, and drank the ſame ſpiritual Drink. The ſame ſpiritual, but other corporal Food.*

A large Citation out of St. Auguſtine.

(a) 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2, 3.

omnes eandem eſcam ſpiritualem manducaverunt, & omnes eundem potum ſpiritualem biberunt. Spiritualem utique eandem, nam corporalem alteram, quia illi Manna, nos aliud, ſpiritualem vero quam nos. *Et adjungit*, Et omnes eundem potum ſpiritualem biberunt. Aliud illi, aliud nos, ſed ſpecie viſibili, quod tamen hoc idem ſignificaret, virtute ſpirituali. Quomodo enim eundem potum? Bibebant, inquit, de ſpirituali ſequenti Petra. Petra autem erat Chriſtus. Inde Panis, unde Potus. Petra Chriſtus in (a) ſignum, verus Chriſtus in Verbo, & in Carne.

LXXIX. Item, Hic eſt Panis de Cœlo deſcendens, ut ſi quis ex ipſo manducaverit, non moriatur; *Sed* (b) *quod pertinet ad virtutem Sacramenti, non quod pertinet ad viſibile Sacramentum, qui manducat intus, non foris; qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente.*

LXXX. Item in poſterioribus verba Salvatoris introducens, *ita dicit.* Hoc vos ſcandalizat, quia dixi Carnem

(a) *In Signo* in impreſſis.
(b) *Qui* utrobique legunt libri impreſſi.

meam

They did eat Manna, we quite another thing. But yet they did eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat with us. He adds, *And they drank the ſame ſpiritual Drink. They drank one thing, and we another, but (a) only as to what outwardly appeared, which by a ſpiritual vertue ſignified the ſame thing. How was it the ſame Drink? They drank,* ſaith he, *of that ſpiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt. Thence had they Bread whence they had Drink. The Rock was Chriſt in a Type, but the true Chriſt was the Word incarnate.*

LXXIX. Again, *(b) This is the Bread which came down from Heaven, whoſoever eats thereof, ſhall never die*; which muſt be underſtood of him who eats the Vertue of the Sacrament, not the meer viſible Sacrament; him who eats inwardly, not outwardly; who feeds on it in his Heart, not who preſſeth it with his Teeth.

LXXX. Again, in what follows, quoting our Saviour's Words, he ſaith, *Doth this offend you, that I ſaid, I give*

(a) In its viſible Nature.
(b) John 6. 63.

meam do vobis manducare, & Sanguinem meum bibere? Si ergo videritis filium hominis ascendentem ubi erat prius. ‘ *Quid est hoc? Hinc solvit* ‘ *quod illos moverat, hinc aperuit unde* ‘ *fuerant scandalizati. Illi enim puta-* ‘ *bant eum erogaturum Corpus suum. Ille* ‘ *autem dixit se ascensurum in Cœlum,* ‘ *utique integrum. Cum videritis Fili-* ‘ *um hominis ascendentem ubi erat prius:* ‘ *Certe vel tunc videbitis, quia non eo* ‘ *modo quo putatis erogat Corpus:* * *certe* ‘ *vel tunc intelligetis, quia Gratia ejus* ‘ *non consumitur morsibus. Et ait,* Spiritus est qui vivificat, Caro non prodest.

LXXXI. Et pluribus interpositis rursus adjicit, Quisquis autem *(inquit idem Apostolus)* Spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est ejus. Spiritus ergo est qui vivificat, Caro autem non prodest quicquam. Verba quæ ego locutus sum vobis, Spiritus & Vita sunt. ‘ *Quid est, Spiritus & Vita sunt? Spi-*

* Impressi legunt *Corpus suum.*

ritualiter

you my Fleſh to eat, and my Blood to drink? What if you ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcending where he was before? What means this? Here he reſolves that which troubled them; here he expounds the Difficulty at which they were offended. For they thought he would have given them his Body; but he tells them, that he ſhould aſcend in his Body entire into Heaven. When you ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend where he was before; certainly then you will ſee, that he did not give his Body in the way which you imagine; then you will underſtand, that the Grace of God is not eaten by Morſels. He ſaith, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing.*

LXXXI. And after many other Paſſages, he adds, 'Whoſoever (ſaith the ſame Apoſtle) *hath not the Spirit of Chriſt is none of his: Therefore it is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing.* (a) *The words which I have ſpoken unto you, are Spirit and life.* 'What means he, by ſaying, they are

(a) John 6. 63.

spiritualiter intelligenda sunt. Intellexisti spiritualiter, Spiritus & Vita sunt; si intellexisti carnaliter, etiam (a) Spiritus & Vita sunt, sed tibi non sunt.

LXXXII. Hujus Authoritate Doctoris Verba Domini tractantis de Sacramento sui Corporis & Sanguinis manifeste docemur, quod illa Verba Domini spiritualiter, & non carnaliter intelligenda sunt, sicut ipse ait, Verba quæ ego loquor vobis Spiritus & Vita sunt. *Verba utique de sua carne manducanda, & de suo sanguine bibendo. Inde enim loquebatur unde Discipuli fuerant scandalizati. Ergo ut non scandalizarentur, revocat eos Divinus Magister de Carne ad Spiritum, de corporea Visione ad Intelligentiam invisibilem.*

LXXXIII. Videmus ergo, esca illa Corporis Domini, & potus ille Sanguinis ejus, secundum quid vere Corpus ejus, &

(a) Codd. Impressi legunt *etiam* [*sic illa*] *Spiritus.*

vere

'Spirit and Life? That they muſt be 'Spiritually underſtood. If thou un-'derſtandeſt them Spiritually, they 'are Spirit and Life, if thou under-'ſtandeſt them Carnally, [even ſo] 'alſo, they are Spirit and Life, but 'not to thee.

LXXXII. By the Authority of this Doctor, treating on the Words of our Lord, touching the Sacrament of his own Body and Blood, we are plainly tanght, That thoſe words of our Lord are to be ſpiritually, and not carnally underſtood; as he himſelf ſaith; *The words which I ſpeak unto you, are Spirit and Life.* That is, his Words concerning eating his Fleſh, & drinking his Blood. He had ſpoken thoſe things at which his Diſciples were offended: Therefore that they might not be offended, their Divine Maſter calleth them back from the Fleſh to the Spirit, from Objects of the outward Senſe (*a*) to the underſtanding of things inviſible.

LXXXIII. So then we ſee, that food of the Lord's Body, & that drink of

(*a*) *That is*, to ſpiritual Objects.

his

vere Sanguis ejus existunt, videlicet secundum quod Spiritus & Vita sunt.

LXXXIV. Item, Quæ idem sunt una definitione comprehenduntur. De vero Corpore Christi dicitur, quod sit verus Deus, & verus Homo. Deus qui ex Deo Patre ante Secula natus; Homo, qui in fine Seculi ex Maria *Virgine genitus. Hæc autem dum de Corpore Christi quod in Ecclesia per Mysterium geritur dici non possunt, secundum quendam modum Corpus Christi esse cognoscitur, & modus iste in Figura est & Imagine, ut Veritas res ipsa sentiatur.*

LXXXV. In Orationibus quæ post Mysterium Corporis Sanguinisque Christi dicuntur, & a Populo respondetur, Amen, *sic Sacerdotis voce dicitur,* (a) Pig-

(a) Deest hæc Oratio in Libro Sacramentario *Gregorii* per *Menardum* edito. Extat vero in secundo Libro Sacramentorum Rom. Eccles. per Thomasium edito in quarto, Romæ 1680. p. 160.

his blood, are in ſome reſpect truly his Body and his Blood; that is, in the ſame reſpect in which they are Spirit and Life.

LXXXIV. Again, thoſe things which are one and the ſame are comprehended under the ſame Definition. We ſay of the true Body of Chriſt, that he is very God, and very Man; God, begotten of God the Father before the World began; and Man born of the Virgin *Mary* in the end of the World. But ſince theſe things cannot be ſaid of the Body of Chriſt, which is myſtically celebrated in the Church, we know that it is only in ſome particular manner the Body of Chriſt; which manner is Figurative, and in the way of an Image; ſo that the Verity is the Thing it ſelf.

LXXXV. In the Prayer uſed after the Myſtery of Chriſt's Body and Blood, to which the People ſay, *Amen*; the Prieſt ſpeaks thus, (a) *We who have now received the Pledge of eter-*

He argues from a Prayer in his time uſed after the H. Communion.

(a) This Prayer is not found in the preſent *Roman* Maſs-book.

nal

nus æternæ vitæ capientes humiliter imploramus, ut quod (a) [in] imagine contingimus Sacramenti, manifesta participatione sumamus.

LXXXVI. Et Pignus enim & Imago alterius rei sunt, id est, non ad se; sed ad aliud aspiciunt. Pignus enim illius rei est pro qua donatur. Imago illius, cujus similitudinem ostendit. Significant enim ista rem cujus sunt, non manifeste ostendunt. Quod cum ita est, apparet quod hoc Corpus & Sanguis Pignus & Imago rei sunt futuræ, ut quod nunc per similitudinem ostenditur, in futuro per manifestationem reveletur. Quod si nunc significant, in futuro autem patefacient, aliud est quod nunc geritur, aliud quod in futuro manifestabitur.

LXXXVII. Qua de re & Corpus Christi, & Sanguis est, quod Ecclesia celebrat, sed tanquam Pignus, tanquam

(a) *In* restitui *ex MS. Laub.*

Imago:

nal Life; most humbly beſeech thee to grant that we may be (a) manifeſtly made partakers of that which here we receive under an Image or Sacrament.

LXXXVI. A Pledge and Image are the Pledge and Image of ſomewhat elſe; that is, they do not reſpect themſelves, but another thing. It is the Pledge of that thing for which it is given, the Image of the thing it repreſents. They ſignifie the thing of which they are the Pledge or Image, but are not the very thing it ſelf. whence it appears, that this Body and Blood of Chriſt are the Pledge and Image of ſomething to come, which is now only repreſented, but ſhall hereafter be (b) plainly exhibited. Now if it only ſignifie at preſent what ſhall be hereafter really exhibited, then it is one thing which is now celebrated, and another which ſhall hereafter be manifeſted.

LXXXVII. Wherefore it is indeed the Body and Blood of Chriſt which the Church celebrates; but in the way

(a) Or, *Really.* (b) Or, *Really.*

of

Imago: Veritas vero erit cum jam nec Pignus nec Imago, ſed ipſius rei Veritas apparebit.

LXXXVIII. Et alibi, (a) Perficiant in nobis, Domine, quæſumus, tua Sacramenta quod continent, ut quæ nunc ſpecie gerimus, rerum veritate capiamus. *Dicit quod* in ſpecie *gerantur iſta, non* in veritate, *id eſt, per ſimilitudinem, non per ipſius rei manifeſtationem. Differunt autem a ſe* Species *&* Veritas. *Quapropter Corpus & Sanguis quod in Eccleſia geritur, differt ab illo Corpore & Sanguine quod in Chriſti Corpore* (b) *jam glorificatum cognoſcitur. Et hoc Corpus Pignus eſt, & Species, illud* (c) *vero ipſa Veritas: Hoc enim geretur donec ad illud perveniatur, ubi vero ad illud perventum fuerit, hoc removebitur.*

(a) Habetur altera ejuſdem Libri *pag.* 135. & in Miſſali Romano. Poſt-Communio in Sabbato quatuor Temporum poſt S. Crucem.

(b) Codd. nonnulli. [*Per reſurrectionem*] *jam glorificatum.*

(c) MS. Lobienſe addit verba hæc emphatica & in omnibus hactenus exemplaribus deſiderata *vero ipſa.*

LXXXIX. Appa-

of a Pledge, or an Image: The truth we ſhall then have, when the Pledge or Image ſhall ceaſe, and the very thing it ſelf ſhall appear.

LXXXVIII. And in another Prayer; *He argues from another Collect.* (*a*) *Let thy Sacrament work in us, O Lord, we beſeech thee, thoſe things which they contain, that we may really be made partakers of thoſe things which now we celebrate in a figure.* He ſaith that theſe things are celebrated in a Figure, not in Truth; that is, by way of Repreſentation, and not the (*b*) Manifeſtation of the Thing it ſelf. Now the Figure and the Truth are very different things: Therefore that Body and Blood of Chriſt which is celebrated in the Church, differs from the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which is glorified. That Body is the Pledge or Figure, but this the very Truth it ſelf; the former we celebrate, till we come to the latter; and when we come to the latter, the former ſhall be done way.

(*a*) This is extant in the ordinary Maſs-Book.

(*b*) Or Real Preſence.

LXXIX. It

LXXXIX. Apparet itaque, quod multa inter se differentia separantur, quantum est inter Pignus & eam rem pro qua Pignus traditur, & quantum inter Imaginem & rem cujus est Imago, & quantum inter Speciem & Veritatem. Videmus itaque multa differentia separari Mysterium Sanguinis & Corporis Christi, quod nunc a Fidelibus sumitur in Ecclesia, & illud quod natum est de Maria *Virgine, quod passum, quod sepultum, quod resurrexit, quod Cœlos ascendit, quod ad Dexteram Patris sedet. Hoc namque quod agitur in via, spiritualiter est accipiendum; quia Fides, quod non videt, credit, & spiritualiter pascit Animam, & lætificat Cor, & vitam præbet æternam & incorruptionem, dum non attenditur quod Corpus pascit, quod dente premitur, quod per partes comminuitur; sed quod in Fide spiritualiter accipitur. At vero Corpus illud in quo passus est, & resurrexit Christus, proprium ejus Corpus existit, de Virginis* Mariæ *Corpore sumptum, palpabile seu visibile etiam post Resurrectionem, sicut ipse Discipulis ait.* * Pal-

* Luc. XXIV. 40. Codd. impressi addunt, *Quid turbati estis & cogitationes ascendunt in corda vestra? Videte manus meas, & pedes meos quia ego ipse sum.*

pate

LXXXIX. It is apparent therefore, that they differ vaſtly, as much as the Pledge, and that whereof it is the Pledge; as much as the Image, and the Thing whoſe Image it is, as much as the Figure and Truth. We ſee then how vaſt a difference there is between the Myſtery of Chriſt's Body and Blood, which the Faithful now receive in the Church, and that Body which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, which ſuffered, was buried, roſe again, aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth at the Right-hand of God. For that Body which is celebrated here in our way, muſt be ſpiritually received; for Faith believes ſomewhat that it ſeeth not; and it ſpiritually feeds the Soul, makes glad the Heart, and confers Eternal Life and Incorruption, if we attend not to that which feeds the Body, which is chewed with our Teeth, and ground to pieces, but to that which is ſpiritually received by Faith. Now that Body in which Chriſt ſuffered, and roſe again, was his own proper Body which he aſſumed of the Virgin, which might be ſeen and felt after his Reſurrection; as he ſaith to his Diſciples; *Luke* 24.40. *Handle me,*

pate & videte; quia Spiritus carnem & ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habere.

XC. Audiamus etiam quid Beatus (*a*) Fulgentius *in Libello de Fide dicat:* Firmissime tene, & nullatenus dubites ipsum Unigenitum, Deum Verbum, Carnem factum, se pro nobis obtulisse Sacrificium & Hostiam Deo in odorem suavitatis; cui cum Patre & Spiritu Sancto a Patriarchis, a Prophetis, & Sacerdotibus tempore veteris Testamenti animalia sacrificabantur; & cui nunc (*b*) id est, tempore novi Testamenti, cum Patre & Spiritu Sancto, cum quibus illi una est Divinitas, Sacrificium Panis & Vini in Fide & Charitate, Sancta Catholica Ecclesia per universum orbem Terræ offerre non cessat. In illis enim carnalibus victimis (*c*) significatio fuit Carnis Christi, quam pro peccatis nostris ipse sine peccato fuerat oblaturus, & (*d*) Sanguis quem erat effusurus in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum. In isto autem Sacrificio Gratiarum actio,

(*a*) *Fulgentius* de Fide, ad *Petrum* Diaconum, c. 19. (*b*) Idem. (*c*) In editis *Figuratio* (*d*) lege Sanguinis.

atque

and ſee, for a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones, as you ſee me have.

XC. Let us hear alſo what St. *Fulgentius* ſpeaks in his Book of *Faith*. *Firmly believe, and doubt not in any wiſe, that the very only begotten Son, God the Word, being made Fleſh (a) offered himſelf for us a Sacrifice and Oblation of a ſweet ſmelling ſavour to God; to whom with the Father and Holy Ghoſt, by Patriarchs, Prophets and Prieſts, living Creatures were ſacrificed in the time of the Old Teſtament; and to whom now, that is, under the New, together with the Father and Holy Ghoſt, with whom he hath one and the ſame Divinity, the Catholick Church throughout the World, ceaſeth not to offer a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine in Faith and Charity. In thoſe Carnal Sacrifices, there was a ſignification of the Fleſh of Chriſt which he without Sin ſhould offer for our Sins, and of that Blood which he was to ſhed on the Croſs for the Remiſſion of our Sins; but in this Sacrifice, there is a Thanksgiving and Commemoration of* *He urges the Authority of* Fulgentius.

(a) Epheſ. 5. 2.

atque commemoratio eſt Carnis Chriſti, quam pro nobis obtulit, & Sanguinis quem pro nobis idem Deus effudit. De quo Beatus *Paulus* Apoſtolus dicit in Actibus Apoſtolorum. (a) *Attendite vobis & univerſo Gregi, in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus poſuit Epiſcopos, regere Eccleſiam Dei quam acquiſivit Sanguine ſuo.* In illis ergo Sacrificiis, quid nobis eſſet donandum figurate ſignificabatur, in hoc autem Sacrificio quid jam nobis donatum ſit evidenter oſtenditur.

XCI. Dicens quod in illis Sacrificiis quid nobis eſſet donandum ſignificabatur, in iſto vero Sacrificio, quid ſit donatum commemoretur, patenter innuit quod ſicut illa Figuram habuerit futurorum, ſic & Sacrificium Figura ſit præteritorum.

XCII. Quibus Dictis quanta differentia ſit inter Corpus in quo paſſus eſt Chriſtus, & hoc Corpus, quod pro ejus Paſſionis commemoratione, ſive Mortis ſit, evidentiſſime declaravit. Illud namque proprium & verum, nihil habens in ſe vel My-

(a) Acts 20. 28.

ſticum,

that Fleſh of Chriſt which he offered for us, and of that Blood, which the ſame [*Chriſt*] *our God, hath ſhed for us: Of which, the Apoſtle St.* Paul, *in the* Acts of the Apoſtles, *ſaith,* (*a*) Take heed to your ſelves and to the whole Flock over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you Biſhops, to rule the Church of God, which he redeemed with his own Blood. *In thoſe Sacrifices, what was to be given for us, was repreſented in a Figure; but in this Sacrifice, what is already given, is evidently ſhewn.*

XCI. By ſaying, That in thoſe Sacrifices was ſignified what ſhould be given for us; but that in this Sacrifice, what is already given is commemorated; he plainly intimates, That as thoſe Sacrifices were a Figure of things to come, ſo this is the Figure of things already paſt.

XCII. By which Expreſſions, he moſt evidently ſhews, how vaſt a difference there is between that Body of Chriſt, in which Chriſt ſuffered, and that Body which we celebrate, in re-

(*a*) Acts 20. 28.

ſticum, vel Figuratum. Hoc vero Myſticum, aliud exterius per Figuram oſtentans, aliud interius, per Intellectum Fidei repræſentans.

XCIII. Ponamus adhuc unum Patris Auguſtini *Teſtimonium, quod & Dictorum Fidem noſtrorum adſtruat, & Sermonis marginem ponat ; in Sermone quem fecit ad Populum de Sacramento Altaris, ſic inſit ;* (*a*) Hoc quod videtis in Altari Dei, (*b*) jam tranſacta nocte vidiſtis, ſed quid eſſet, quid ſibi vellet, quam magnæ rei Sacramentum contineret, nondum audiviſtis. Quod ergo videtis Panis eſt & Calix, quod vobis etiam oculi veſtri renunciant. Quod autem Fides veſtra poſtulat inſtruenda, Panis eſt Corpus Chriſti, Calix (*c*) eſt Sanguis Chriſti. Breviter quidem hoc dictum eſt, quod Fidei forte ſufficiat, ſed Fides inſtructionem deſiderat. Dicit enim Propheta, *Niſi credideritis, non intelligetis.* Poteſtis ergo

(*a*) Extat hic Sermo ad calcem Epiſtolæ *Fulgentii* ad *Ferrandum* Diaconum de Baptiſmo *Æthiopis* moribundi, editæ inter alia *Fulgentii* Opuſcula per *Jacobum Sirmondum*, 8. *Par.* 1612. (*b*) *Etiam* in impreſſis. (*c*) Non legitur *Eſt* in impreſſis.

(*a*) di-

membrance of his Death and Paſſion: For the former is properly and truly his Body, having nothing myſtical or figurative in it. The latter is myſtical, ſhewing one thing to our outward Senſes by a Figure, and inwardly repreſenting another thing by Faith.

XCIII. Let me add one Teſtimony more of Father *Auguſtine*, which will confirm what I have ſaid, and ſhall put an end to my Diſcourſe; in his Sermon to the People touching the Sacrament of the Altar: Thus he ſaith, *What it is which you ſee upon God's Altar, you were ſhewn laſt Night; but you have not yet heard what it is, what it meaneth, and of how great a Thing this is a Sacrament. That which you ſee, is Bread and the Cup; thus much your own Eyes inform you: But that wherein your Faith needs Inſtruction, is, that this Bread is the Body of Chriſt, and the Cup is the Blood of Chriſt. This is a ſhort account of the Matter, and perhaps as much as Faith requires; but Faith needeth further Inſtruction; as it is written,* (a) Ex-

He concludes with another Teſtimony of S. Auguſtine.

(a) Iſa. 7. 9.

(*a*) dicere mihi, Præcepiſti ut credamus, expone, ut intelligamus. Poteſt enim animo cujuſpiam cogitatio talis oboriri. Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus novimus unde acceperit Carnem, de Virgine ſcilicet *Maria*. Infans lactatus eſt, nutritus eſt, crevit, ad juvenilem ætatem perductus eſt, a *Judæis* perſecutionem paſſus eſt, (*b*) Ligno ſuſpenſus eſt, interfectus eſt, de Ligno depoſitus eſt, ſepultus eſt, tertio die reſurrexit, quo die voluit in Cœlum aſcendit; illuc levavit Corpus ſuum (*c*) inde venturus eſt judicare vivos & mortuos; ibi eſt modo ſedens ad Dexteram Patris. Quomodo Panis Corpus ejus? Et Calix, vel quod habet Calix, quomodo eſt Sanguis ejus? Iſta, Fratres, ideo dicuntur Sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, & aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, ſpeciem habet corporalem; quod intelligitur, fructum habet ſpiritualem.

XCIV. Iſta venerabilis Author dicens, inſtruit nos, quid de proprio Cor-

---

(*a*) *Modo* addunt hic Impreſſi. (*b*) Repetunt hic Impreſſi *in Ligno*. (*c*) *Unde* legit *Sirmondus*.

pore

cept you believe, you will not underſtand. *You may be apt to ſay to me, You require us to believe, expound to us, that we may underſtand. Such a Thought as this may ariſe in any man's Heart. We know that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt took Fleſh of the Virgin* Mary; *when an Infant, he was ſuckled, nouriſhed, grew, and arrived to the Age of a young Man, was Perſecuted by the* Jews, *ſuffered, was hanged on a Tree, put to Death, taken down, and buried, the third day he roſe again, and on that day himſelf pleaſed, he aſcended the Heavens, and carried up his Body thither, and ſhall from thence come to Judge both quick and dead, where he is now ſitting at the right Hand of the Father. How is Bread his Body, and how is the Cup, or the Liquor in the Cup, his Blood? Theſe, my Brethren, are ſtiled Sacraments, becauſe in them we ſee one thing, and underſtand another. That which we ſee, hath a Bodily Nature; that which is underſtood, hath a Spiritual Fruit, or Efficacy.*

XCIV. In theſe Words, this Venerable Author inſtructs us, what we ought to believe touching the proper Body of Chriſt, which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and now ſitteth at the

pore Domini, quod de Maria *natum, & nunc ad Dexteram Patris ſedet, & in quo venturus eſt judicare vivos & mortuos; Et quid de iſto quod ſuper Altare ponitur, & Populo participatur, ſentire debeamus: Illud integrum eſt, neque ulla ſectione dividitur, nec ullis Figuris obvelatur: Hoc vero quod ſuper Menſam Domini continetur, & Figura eſt, quia Sacramentum eſt, & exterius quod videtur, Speciem habet corpoream, quæ paſcit Corpus; interius vero quod intelligitur, Fructum habet ſpiritualem, qui vivificat Animam.*

XCV. Et de hoc Myſtico Corpore volens apertius & manifeſtius loqui, ſic dicit (a) in conſequentibus: Corpus ergo Chriſti ſi (b) vultis intelligere, Apoſtolum audite dicentem, Vos eſtis Corpus Chriſti & Membra (c) [Si ergo vos eſtis Corpus Chriſti & Membra,] Myſterium veſtrum in Menſa Domini poſitum eſt. Myſterium (d) Veſtrum accipitis, ad id quod eſtis, *Amen*, reſpondetis, & reſpondendo

(a) Apud *Fulgentium*, Ibidem.

(b) *Sirmondus* legit, *Vis* & *Audi*.

(c) *Hæc verba unculis incluſa Librarii errore in MS. Lobiencſi omittuntur.* (d) *Domini* male.

ſub-

the right Hand of God, and in which he will come to Judge the Quick and the Dead; as alſo, touching that Body which is placed on the Altar, and received by the People. The former is entire, neither ſubject to be cut or divided, nor is it veiled under any Figure. But the latter, which is ſet on the Lord's Table, is a Figure, becauſe it is a Sacrament. That which is outwardly ſeen, hath a Corporeal Nature, which feeds the Body; but that which is underſtood to be contained within it, hath a ſpiritual Fruit, or Virtue, and quickneth the Soul.

XCV. And in the following Words, having a Mind to ſpeak more plainly and openly touching this Myſtical Body, he ſaith, *If you have a mind to underſtand the Body of Chriſt, hearken to the Apoſtle, who ſaith, Ye are the Body of Chriſt, and his Members: And* [*if ye are the Body of Chriſt, and his Members, then*] *there is a Myſtical Repreſentation of your ſelves ſet on the Lord's Table. You receive the Myſtery of your ſelves, and anſwer*, Amen; *and by that Anſwer* (a) *ſubſcribe to*

(a) *i.e.* Own your ſelves to be the Body and Members of Chriſt.

what

ſubſcribitis. Audis ergo Corpus Chriſti, & reſpondes *Amen*, eſto Membrum Chriſti, ut verum ſit *Amen*. Quare ergo in Pane? Nihil hic de noſtro adferamus: (*a*) Ipſum Apoſtolum dicentem audiamus; cum (*b*) de iſto Sacramento loqueretur, ait. *Unus Panis, Unum Corpus, multi ſumus in Chriſto*, & reliqua.

XCVI. S. Auguſtinus *ſatis nos inſtruit, quod ſicut in Pane ſuper Altare poſitum, Corpus Chriſti ſignatur; ſic etiam & Corpus accipientis Populi: ut evidenter oſtendat; quod Corpus Chriſti proprium illud exiſtat in quo natus de Virgine, in quo lactatus, in quo paſſus, in quo mortuus, in quo ſepultus, in quo reſurrexit, in quo Cœlos aſcendit, in quo Patris ad Dextram ſedet, in quo venturus eſt ad Judicium. Hoc autem quod ſupra Menſam Dominicam poſitum eſt, Myſterium continet illius, ſicut etiam identidem Myſterium continet Corporis Populi credentis, Apoſtolo teſtante,* (*c*) Unus Panis, Unum Corpus, multi ſumus in Chriſto.

(*a*) Apoſtolum item audiamus, *in Impreſſis.*
(*b*) Cum ergo, *in Impreſſis.*
(*c*) Dicente *Codd. nonnulli.*

XCVII. Ani-

what you are. Thou hearest the Body of Chriſt named, and anſwereſt, Amen; *become thou a Member of Chriſt, that thy* Amen *may be true.* (*a*) *But why in the Bread? I ſhall offer nothing of my own, but let us hear what the Apoſtle* (*b*) *himſelf ſpeaks of this Sacrament; who ſaith,* And we being many, are one Bread, and one Body in Chriſt, *&c.*

XCVI. St. *Auguſtine* ſufficiently teaches us, That as in the Bread ſet upon the Altar, the Body of Chriſt is ſignified, ſo is likewiſe the Body of the People who receive it. That he might evidently ſhew, That Chriſt's proper Body is that in which he was born of the Virgin, was ſuckled, ſuffered, died, was buried, and roſe again, in which he aſcended the Heavens, ſitteth on the right Hand of the Father, and in which he ſhall come again to Judgment: But this which is placed upon the Lord's Table, contains a Myſtery of that, as alſo the Myſtery of the Body of the Faithful People; according to that of the Apoſtle; *And we being many, are one Bread and one Body in Chriſt.*

(*a*) *i. e.* How are we repreſented as Chriſt's Body in the Bread?

(*b*) 1 *Cor.* 10. 17.

XCVII. Your

XCVII. Animadvertat, Clariſſime Princeps, Sapientia veſtra, quod poſitis Sanctarum Scripturarum Teſtimoniis, & Sanctorum Patrum Dictis, evidentiſſime monſtratum eſt, quod Panis, qui Corpus Chriſti, & Calix qui Sanguis Chriſti appellatur, Figura ſit, quia Myſterium; & quod non parva differentia ſit inter Corpus, quod per Myſterium exiſtit, & Corpus quod paſſum eſt, & ſepultum, & reſurrexit. Quoniam hoc proprium Salvatoris Corpus exiſtit, nec in eo vel aliqua Figura, vel aliqua Significatio, ſed ipſa rei Manifeſtatio cognoſcitur, & ipſius Viſionem Credentes deſiderant; quoniam ipſum eſt Caput noſtrum, & ipſo viſo ſatiabitur deſiderium noſtrum. Quo (a) ipſe & Pater unum ſunt; *non ſecundum quod Corpus habet Salvator, ſed ſecundum plenitudinem Divinitatis, quæ habitat in homine Chriſto.*

XCVIII. At in iſto quod per Myſterium geritur, Figura eſt, non ſolum proprii Corporis Chriſti, verum etiam Credentis in Chriſtum Populi. Utriuſque namque Corporis, id eſt, & Chriſti quod paſſum eſt, & reſurrexit, & Populi in Chriſto (b) *renati, atque de mortuis vivificati Figuram geſtat.*

(a) Melius Codd. impreſſi *quoniam.*

(b) Impreſſi legunt *in Chriſto* [per Baptiſmum] *renati.*

XCIX. Ad

XCVII. Your Wiſdom, Moſt Illuſtrious Prince, may obſerve, how both by Teſtimonies out of the Holy Scriptures, and the Fathers, it is moſt evidently demonſtrated, That the Bread, which is called the Body of Chriſt, and the Cup which is called the Blood of Chriſt, is a Figure, becauſe it is a Myſtery; and that there is a vaſt Difference between that which is his Body Myſtically, and that Body which ſuffered, was buried, and roſe again: For this was our Saviour's proper Body; nor is there any Figure or Signification in it; but it is the very thing it ſelf. And the Faithful deſire the Viſion of him, becauſe he is our Head; and when we ſhall ſee him, our Deſire will be ſatisfied; (*a*) *For he and the Father are one:* Not in reſpect of our Saviour's Body, but foraſmuch as the Fulneſs of the Godhead dwelleth in the Man Chriſt. *He determines this ſecond Queſtion in the negative.*

XCVIII. But in that Body which is celebrated in a Myſtery, there is a Figure, not only of the proper Body of Chriſt, but alſo of the People which believe in Chriſt: For it is a

(*a*) 1 John 10. 30.

Figure

XCIX. Addamus etiam quod iſte Panis & Calix, qui Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti nominatur, & (a) exiſtit, Memoriam repræſentat Dominicæ Paſſionis, ſive Mortis, quemadmodum ipſe in Evangelio dixit; Hoc facite in mei commemorationem. *Quod exponens Apoſtolus* Paulus *ait*, Quotieſcunque manducabitis Panem hunc, & Calicem bibetis, Mortem Domini annunciabitis donec veniat.

C. Docemur a Salvatore, necnon a Sancto Paulo *Apoſtolo, quod iſte Panis & iſte (b) Sanguis qui ſuper Altare ponitur in Figuram, ſive in Memoriam Dominicæ Mortis ponuntur, ut quod geſtum eſt in præterito, preſenti revocet Memoriæ, ut illius Paſſionis memores effecti, per eam efficiamur Divini Muneris Conſortes, per quam ſumus a Morte liberati. Cognoſcentes quod ubi pervenerimus ad Viſionem Chriſti, talibus non opus habebimus inſtrumentis quibus ad-*

(a) *Et exiſtit*, Addidi hæc verba monitus à *Mabillonio*, locum ita extare in MS *Laubienſi*. Acta *Bened.* Sæcul. 4. *p.* 2. in Præf. n. 130. Nec quicquam tamen juvat Pontificiorum cauſam hæc additio; agnoſcunt enim Reformati, Panem & Calicem non ſolum Corpus & Sanguinem Chriſti nominari, ſed etiam exiſtere *ſpiritualiter.*

(b) *Calix*, Forte reponendum eſt.

mo-

Figure repreſenting both Bodies; to wit, that of Chriſt, in which he died, and roſe again, and that of the People which are regenerated, and raiſed from the Dead [by Baptiſm] into Chriſt.

XCIX. And let me add, That the Bread and Cup, which is called, and is the Body and Blood of Chriſt, repreſents the Memory of the Lord's Paſſion or Death; as himſelf teacheth us in the Goſpel, ſaying, (*a*) *This do in Remembrance of me.* Which St. *Paul* the Apoſtle expounding, ſaith, (*b*) *As oft as you eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, you ſhew forth the Lord's Death till he come.*

C. We are here taught both by our Saviour, and alſo by St. *Paul* the Apoſtle, That the Bread and Blood which is placed upon the Altar, is ſet there for a Figure, or in remembrance of the Lord's Death; that what was really done long ſince, may be called to our preſent Remembrance; that having his Paſſion in our mind, we may be made partakers of that Divine Gift, whereby we are ſaved

(*a*) Luke 22. 19. (*b*) 1 Cor. 11. 26.

moneamur quid pro nobis immensa Benignitas sustinuerit. Quoniam ipsum facie ad faciem contemplantes non per exteriorem temporalium rerum admonitionem commovebimur, sed per ipsius contemplationem Veritatis aspiciemus, quemadmodum nostræ Salutis Autori gratias agere debeamus.

CI. Nec ideo quoniam ista dicimus, putetur in Mysterio Sacramenti Corpus Domini, vel Sanguinem ipsius, non a Fidelibus sumi, quando Fides, non quod Oculus videt, sed quod credit, accipit; quoniam spiritualis est Esca, & spiritualis Potus, spiritualiter animam pascens, & Æternæ Satietatis vitam tribuens: Sicut ipse Salvator Mysterium hoc commendans, loquitur; Spiritus est qui vivificat, nam Caro nihil prodest.

CII. Imperio vestræ Magnitudinis parere cupientes, præsumpsi parvus, rebus de non minimis disputare; non sequentes æstimationis nostræ præsumptionem, sed Majorum intuentes Auctoritatem; quæ si probaveritis Catholice dicta,

from Death: Knowing well, that when we ſhall come to the Viſion of Chriſt, we ſhall need no ſuch Inſtruments to admoniſh us, what his Infinite Goodneſs was pleaſed to Suffer for our ſakes; for when we ſhall ſee him face to face, we ſhall not by the outward Admonition of Temporal things, but by the Contemplation of the very thing it ſelf, ſhall underſtand how much we are obliged to give Thanks to the Author of our Salvation.

CI. But in what I ſay, I would not have it thought, That the Lord's Body and Blood is not received by the Faithful in the Sacramental Myſteries; for Faith receives not that which the Eye beholds, but what it ſelf believes. It is Spiritual Meat, and Spiritual Drink, ſpiritually feeding the Soul, and affording a Life of eternal Satisfaction; as our Saviour himſelf, commending this Myſtery, ſpeaks: (a) *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing.*

CII. Thus in Obedience to your Majeſties Command, I, though a very inconſiderable Perſon, have ad-

(a) John 6. 63.

ta, vestræ Meritis Fidei deputate, quæ deposita Regalis Magnificentiæ Gloria, non erubuit ab humili quærere Responsum Veritatis. Sin autem minus placuerint, id nostræ deputetur Insipientiæ, quæ quod optavit, minus efficaciter (a) *valuit explicare.*

(a) *Valuit*; Ita *Colon.* Editio, 1551. Et MS. Lob. Impressorum alii *voluit*, alii *potuit* legunt.

FINIS.

ventured to diſpute touching Points of no ſmall Moment not following any preſumptuous Opinion of my own; but having a conſtant regard to the Authority of the Ancients: If your Majeſty ſhall approve what I have ſaid, as Catholick, aſcribe it to the merit of your own Faith; which, laying aſide your Royal Glory and Magnificence, condeſcended to enquire after the Truth of ſo mean a Perſon. And if what I have ſaid, pleaſe you not, impute it to my own Weakneſs, which renders me incapable of explaining this Point ſo well as I deſired.

FINIS.

I shall only note by the way, that the old word † *Housel*, which is frequently used in this Homily, to signifie the Holy Eucharist, is of Gothick Extraction, and derived from Hunsl, a Sacrifice, in Saxon Husel, the letter N, being here, as in some other Instances, left out to soften the Pronunciation. [illegible] Ancestors filled the Holy Eucharist a Sacrifice, as the Fathers, both Greek and Latin antiently did in a large and improper Style, viz. Either as it is a Commemoration of that proper Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, or as Alms, Prayers, and Thanksgiving are sometimes called a Sacrifice.

---

† Hurel ab Hostia derivari modeste conjicit Eruditissimus Sommerus, ut rectius omnino Cl. Junius in Glossario a Gothico HUNSL deducit Saxonicum Hurel, litera N, euphonia gratia, uti in nonnullis aliis origine Gothicis e medio Sublata, ex. gr. Tunth Gothice, Saxonice Toð, Anglice Tooth, Menth Gothice, Saxonice Muð, Anglice Mouth, &c.

AN APPENDIX TO RATRAM, OR BERTRAM.

In which Monſieur *Boileau*'s French Verſion of that Author, and his Notes upon him are Conſidered, and his unfair Dealings in both Detected.

LONDON,
Printed in the Year, MDCLXXXVIII.

A

About Three Months after
had first Published this Tract, I was acquainted by
a Friend that it was newly Printed at
Paris, with a quite contrary deligh
To shew there the Sentiment
touching the Sacrament
earth were exactly conform
Switzerland. Hereupon
was made the very declaration
e Book, but living near an Hon
Miles from Zurich, it was about
Months more, ere I could pro

AN APPENDIX TO RATRAM, OR BERTRAM, &c.

ABout Three Months after I had firſt Publiſh'd this ſmall Tract, I was acquainted by a Friend that it was newly Printed at *Paris*, with a quite contrary deſign, *viz.* To ſhew there the Sentiments of *Ratram*, touching the Sacrament of the Euchariſt were exactly conformable to the Faith of the *Roman* Church. This News made me very deſirous to ſee the Book, but living near an Hundred Miles from *London*, it was above ſix Months more, ere I could procure

it. At firſt view I perceived the Publiſher (a) was a Perſon of no ſmall Figure in the *French* Church; and that he had ſeveral other Doctors of the *Sorbon* to avouch, (b) *That there is nothing either in his Verſion or Notes, but what is agreeable to the Text of that Ancient Writer.* But upon further peruſal I ſoon found that *Monſieur Boileau*, had rather given us his own Paraphraſe, than the Author's Words in *French*; that his deſign was not ſo much a Tranſlation, as the Converſion of *Bertram*; and that he had made almoſt as great and wonderful a change in his Doctrine, as that which the Romaniſts pretend to be wrought in the Euchariſt it ſelf. I confeſs his Undertaking ſeemed both uſeful and ſeaſonable, and well deſerving encouragement; for if he proceed ſucceſsful in it (in the preſent juncture) it muſt needs much facilitate the Converſions in hand. And unleſs ſome ſuch way can be found out to bring over the *Old* Hereticks,

(a) *James Boileau*, Doctor in Divinity of the College of *Sorbon*, and Dean of the Metropolitan Church of *Sens*.

(b) See the Approbation at the end.

who

who for a Thouſand Years together after CHRIST, taught that *The Bread and Wine remain after Conſecration*; and that, *It is not the Natural Body of our Saviour, which is orally received in the Holy Sacrament.* The poor Hugonots will ſtill be of Opinion, *That they ought not to diſtruſt the Judgment of their Senſes, confirmed by Scripture and Antiquity, or to reſign their Underſtandings to any Church Authority on Earth.*

But the miſery of it is, that the Doctor hath not been more generous in his Undertaking, than he is unfortunate in his performance: For tho' the Abjurations of the new Converts, cannot be more againſt their private Senſe, than Dr. *Boileau*'s Expoſition is againſt the Senſe of this Author; yet as they recant their forced Subſcriptions, whenever they can eſcape out of *France*; ſo *Bertram* when permitted to ſpeak his own Words in *Latine*, contradicts whatever this Tranſlator hath forced him againſt his mind to ſay in *French*. But how ill ſoever he hath treated the Author in French, we muſt acknowledg our ſelves very much obliged to him, for

giving us the *Latin* Text, (c) according to *F. Mabillons* correct Copy of the *Lobes* Manuſcript. We thank him heartily for it, and it is no ſmall piece of Juſtice he hath done us, to ſhew the World that the former Printed Copies were not corrupted by us, as ſome have pretended. That the Variations from them are inconſiderable, generally in the order of the Syntax, or the uſe of ſome other word of like ſignification; and where the Doctor himſelf thinks the variations material, the advantage (if any be) lies on our ſide.

In his Preface and Remarks, I meet with nothing of any moment, which is not obviated, and fully cleared in my (d) Diſſertation. For I had conſidered the main things on which he inſiſts, in the Writings of *F. Mabillon*, and *Natalis Alexander*, and given them an Anſwer. If he had borrowed *F. Mabillon*'s Modeſty and Ingenuity, as he hath done his Arguments, or contented himſelf with them, he would have eſcaped many foul imputations, which will now unavoidably

(c) See his Preface, p. 18.
(d) In Chapters IV. and V.

diſ-

diſparage either his *Judgment*, or his *Integrity*.

There are two things which diſable me for a thorough examination of Monſieur *Boileau*'s Work; the one is the want * of ſome Books, which it were neceſſary for me to conſult on this occaſion, which cannot be here procured; and the other, the want of a little more critical Skill in the *French*, in order to the more effectual diſcovery of his unfair dealing. However under theſe diſavantages, I doubt not to convince all unprejudiced Perſons, of theſe three things.

1. Firſt, That Monſieur *Boileau* hath groſly miſrepreſented the deſign and ſentiments of *Ratram*, in this Book.

2. That he hath not acted the part of a Faithful Tranſlator, nor uſed that exactneſs which himſelf, and his Approvers pretend, but on the contrary hath all along accommodated his Verſion to his own Hypotheſis, and not the Authors Words.

3. That his Expoſition of the Controverted Terms in this Diſcourſe,

---

* *Dacherij Spicilegium.* Mabillonij *Analecta*, &c.

both in his Preface and Remarks is often very abſurd, that thoſe Terms cannot bear his Senſe, nor are they uſed therein by other Eccleſiaſtical Writers, either of the ſame or elder times.

And the proof of theſe, will be a full confutation of this Doctors confident Pretence, that this Book of *Ratram contains no other Sentiments, than thoſe of that Church*, which he ſtiles, *Catholick, Apoſtolick and Roman, touching the Sacrament of the Euchariſt.*

Before I enter upon the firſt part of my Undertaking, it will not be amiſs to take a ſhort view of Monſieur *Boileau*'s Preface, the ſum of which is this.

"That although this piece of *Ratram* is one of the moſt conſider-
"able Monuments of the Ninth Cen-
"tury, and ſerves admirably to clear
"the perpetuity of the Faith touch-
"ing the Euchariſt, yet it hath lain in
"the dark, and been taken notice of,
"by almoſt no body, from his own
"time till it was Printed at *Colen, An-*
"*no Dom.* 1532. That upon its firſt
"appearance in publick, it met with
"very odd entertainment, and quite
"contrary to what it deſerved; be-
"ing

"ing challenged by the *Proteſtants* as
"favourable to their Sentiments, and
"given up by the *Roman Catholicks* as
"an Impudent and Heretical Forge-
"ry. Inſomuch, that this Tract was
"put into the *Index* of Prohibited
"Books made in the Council of *Trent*,
"*Anno Dom.* 1559. and ſtands con-
"demned in the ſucceeding *Indices*,
"and the moſt eminent Doctors of
"that Communion have ever ſince e-
"ſteemed it a Dangerous and Hereti-
"cal Piece. Some few indeed have
"treated poor *Ratram* a little more
"favourably. The *Lovain* Divines,
"who compiled the *Belgick Index*, de-
"clare that with the help of a Catho-
"lick Expoſition, he may be tolera-
"ted. And *M. de Sainte Bœuve*, Kings
"Profeſſor of Divinity in the *Sorbon*,
"did in the Year 1655. generouſly
"undertake the Defence of his Do-
"ctrine in his publick Lectures. But
"after all, no leſs a man than *Petrus*
"*de Marca* and others, have been
"ſince labouring to prove, that this
"Book was written by *Joannes Scotus*,
"and not *Ratram*, and is the ſame
"that was condemned in the *Berenga-*
"*rian* Controverſie by the Synods of
"*Rome* and *Vercelli*. Having rejected

"this

" this, and all other hard cenſures, he " tells us that *Ratram's* Sentiments are " entirely Catholick, and not in the " leaſt contrary to the Doctrine of " *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, or the preſent " Roman Church; and this he doubts " not to make evident, by his Tran- " ſlation of *Bertram* into French, and " the Expoſition of his obſcure terms " given in this Preface, and the re- " marks which he hath added to juſti- " fie his Tranſlation.

Having given this general account of Mr. *Boileau*'s Work, I ſhall ſhew how he repreſents the Scope and Sentiments of our Author.

In the *Negative*, (a) *That he doth not impugn the Doctrine of the Real Preſence, or Tranſubſtantiation, nor diſpute againſt the Opinion of* Paſchaſius Radbertus. But on the contrary, (b) *That he and* Paſchaſius *teach the ſame Doctrine.*

(a) *Que cet Auteur n'a point eu d' autre creance que celle de la realite & de la Tranſubſtantiation.* Preface, p. 10.

(b) *Cet Auteur n'eſt point oppoſe a* Paſchaſe, *ny a la Doctrine de l' Egliſe Catholique.* Ibid. and p. 23, 24.

2. In

2. In the *Affirmative*, (c) *That this Book was written against certain Catholick Divines*, tho not against the *real Presence and Transubstantiation*. And that the Opinions which he encounters, are these (d) two.

1. That, *The Body of our Lord received in the Holy Sacrament, is exposed naked to our bodily Senses, without any Figure or Vail whatsoever.*

2. That *the Body of Christ which is visible and orally received in the Holy Sacrament*, or whatever is the object of *Sense therein* (which as (e) Mr. *Boileau* expounds this Tract, is only the *Species* or *Accidents* of Bread and Wine) *is the self same Body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, Crucified, Dead and Buried:* That is, his true and natural Body.

Now in this account of the Design and Sentiments of *Ratram*, this Doctor is either grosly mistaken himself, or else he grosly abuseth his Reader. And this I hope to make out, both by

(c) *Ce livre de* Ratramne *est fait contre des Theologiens Catholiques, mais pas contre le Sentiment Catholique*, p. 21.

(d) See page, 22. 23.

(e) Preface, p. 25. & in Versione passim.

shew-

ſhewing the weakneſs of thoſe Arguments he offers for it, and alſo by producing better Reaſons againſt it.

The Sum of what is ſaid to ſupport the *Negative*, *viz.* "That *Ratram* doth not confute the Sentiments of "*Paſchaſius*, or the Doctrine of Tran-"ſubſtantiation, may be reduced to theſe three things.

1 (f) The Silence of all Authors from his own time, to the Year 1532. (eſpecially in the *Berengarian* Controverſie) none, ſave *F. Cellot*'s Anonymus, once mentioning him as an Adverſary to *Paſchaſius*.

2. (g) The Silence of *Ratram* himſelf, who never mentions *Paſchaſius*, or his Book, nor the real Preſence; but on the contrary, uſes terms proper to eſtabliſh Tranſubſtantiation.

3. (h) That many Learned Writers of the Roman Communion, eſpecially ſince Manuſcript Copies of it have been found, have eſteem'd this Piece very Orthodox.

To the Firſt I anſwer, That the pretended Silence of Authors, hinders

(f) Preface, p. 2, 3, 4.
(g) *Ibid*, p. 21, 25, 26.
(h) *Ibid*, p. 8, 9, 10, 12.

not

not but that *Ratram* might impugn the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius*. When two Authors of the ſame time handle one and the ſame Argument, and the one advanceth this Propoſition, *That the Body of Chriſt received orally in the Sacrament, is the ſame Body which was born of the Virgin, Suffered on the Croſs, and roſe from the Grave*, as *Paſchaſius* did; and the other puts the Propoſition into the Form of a Queſtion, and determines it in the *Negative*, as (i) *Bertram* hath done: I conceive there needs no witneſs to make any man (who is not ſunk quite over head and ears into Scepticiſm) believe that this latter oppoſeth the Doctrine of the former.

But Secondly, He doth not ſay that no body hath mentioned him as an Adverſary to *Paſchaſius*; he acknowledgeth that *F. Cellots* Anonymous Author, hath expreſly affirmed it. And tho' he thinks it enough to invalidate his Credit, by ſaying of him (as the Biſhop of *Meaux* doth of *M.*

(i) Through the whole diſcuſſion of the Second Queſtion.

Imbert,

Imbert, (k) *He is a man of neither Repute nor Learning*) that he is an Author of *little Senſe or Merit, whoſe Name, or Age cannot be diſcovered.* This will not ſerve his turn, for the credibility of a Witneſs depends more upon a man's Honeſty, and the means he hath of truly informing himſelf touching the matter he atteſts, than on his renown, or deep Learning; an ordinary Pariſh Prieſt may be as credible a Witneſs of a matter of Fact within his knowledg, as the Biſhop of *Meaux*, or the Dean of the Metropolitical Church of *Sens*. We were in a miſerable caſe, if none under the Dignity of a Dean could tell Truth; or if we were to know no more than ſome *Sorbon* Doctors are content to let us. But what if Mr. *Boileau* be miſtaken when he tells us (that by the confeſſion of all Mankind) he hath little Senſe or Reaſon, and that his Age is unknown? What if his Time and Name be well known, and he appear to have been an Author of ſome Figure and Note for Learn-

(k) See the Biſhop of *Meaux* his Letter in the Vindication of his Expoſition. p. 116. *Un homme ſans nom comme ſans ſcavoir.*

ing?

ing? F. (1) *Mabillon* thinks he knows both his Name and Time, and that he was no meaner a Perſon than *Herigerus* Abbat of *Lobes*, who lived about 120 Years after *Ratram*. But if the diſcovery had never been made, it is a ſlender Argument that he was not worth the Publiſhing, becauſe *Sirmondus*, and Arch-Biſhop *Uſher*, could have Publiſhed him, but did not: How many other Authors which they could have Publiſhed, but did not, muſt be judged worthleſs Scribblers, if this be true reaſoning? Let M. *Boileau* deſpiſe him as much as he pleaſeth, he is a far better Witneſs that *Ratram* wrote againſt *Paſchaſius*, than any he can produce to inform us who thoſe Divines were in the Ninth Century, that held the Opinions of *Abbaudus*, and Prior *Gaultier*, the imaginary Adverſaries which he makes him to encounter. He can neither

(1) *Acta Ben. S. IV. p. 2. Præf. n. 48. Proinde auctorem* Herigerum *Abbatem* Laubienſem *affirmare non vereor. De* Herigero *autem* Girardus *in vita Adalhardi Corbeienſis apud* Mabillon. *Ibidem n. 48. Abbas Laubienſis* HERIGERUS, *qui eo tempore inter Sapientes habebatur celeberrimus.*

ſhew

ſhew the Books of that time, wherein thoſe Opinions are taught, nor yet prove by any Author, that they were then held by any body. That (m) neither *Sigebertus Gemblacenſis*, nor *Trithemius* (who both mention this Tract) ſay any thing of its being written againſt *Paſchaſius* is no convincing Proof that it was not. For thoſe Authors ordinarily give us no further account of Books, than the bare Titles afford, and they omit many unqueſtionable Works of thoſe Writers whom they mention. F. *Mabillon* (n) makes no doubt but the two Books, *De partu Virginis*, were Written by *Paſchaſius* againſt *Ratram*'s Book on that Subject; yet neither *Sigebert* or *Trithemius* ſay one Word of that Diſpute; nor can M. *Boileau* produce any one Writer from thoſe times to the beginning of this Century, who ſo much as mentions it: Neither the Popes, nor thoſe Councils which they aſſembled againſt *Berengarius*, at *Rome* and *Verceli* doubted but *Joannes Scotus* wrote againſt

(m) Preface, p. 4.

(n) *Acta Ben. S. IV. p. 2. Præf. n.* 149. 150.

Paſ-

chaſius; and yet neither (o) *Trithemius*, nor *Sigebert* (p) (who lived, and was a Writer in the latter daies of *Berengarius*) ſaith one Syllable of it. As for Biſhop *Fiſher*, he did not (as M. *Boileau* pretends) (q) cite *Bertram*, he only mentions his Name among other Catholick Writers on that Subject.

His Second Argument concludes as little as the firſt; for we pretend not that this Tract was written againſt the Book of *Paſchaſius*, but only againſt his Sentiments; ſo that there was no occaſion to mention it. It was upon the command of his Prince, who propounded thoſe two Queſtions, that he medled with this Controverſie; and if he wrote about the Year 850. whilſt *Paſchaſius* was Abbot of *Corbey*; there is another obvious

(o) No very accurate Writers, who make two Authors of *Joannes Scotus*, and *Joannes Erigena*, as Mr. *Sclater* or his Printer doth, p. 76. Trithem. *de Script. Eccleſ. fol.* 63. & 65. *Quarto, Paris*, 1512. Sigeb. *cap.* 65. & *cap.* 95.

(p) He wrote in Defence of the Emperor, *Henry* IV. againſt Pope *Gregory* VII. & *Paſchal* II. And Died *A. D.* 1113.

(q) Preface, p. 4. *Qui le cite.*

Reason, for his Silence in that Point.

But tho we confess that this Tract confutes not the Book of *Paschasius*; yet we think it too boldly said (r) *That it makes as little mention of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, as it doth of Stercoranism*; unless his meaning be, that they are not mentioned in those proper Terms, which were not then in use. He ought to be very well assured, that *Veritas* in *Bertram*, doth not signifie *Verity* of *Nature*, but such a *Verity as is discerned by our bodily Senses*; otherwise he must retract this confident Assertion, and give us leave to believe some other great Doctors (s) of the *Sorbon*, who do acknowledg that he both mentions and denies them.

But whether he doth or not, as also whether he uses Terms proper to establish Transubstantiation, I shall have a fitter occasion hereafter of discoursing with our Author; and shall therefore proceed to consider,

What he can fairly collect from the favourable Opinion, which some Learned Doctors of the Church of

(r) Preface, p. 21.
(s) *Espenceus, Genebrard, &c.*

Rome

Rome have had of this Piece. The *Lovain* Doctors think he needs a Comment to give him a tolerable Senſe: And though Writing *inviſibly* for *viſibly*, be but the Correction of a Typographical Error, yet the Expoſition of *external Species, or Accidents of the Creatures*, where the Author ſaith, *the ſubſtance of the Creatures*, and the other that follows is a Gloſs that marrs the Text, at leaſt when (t) the Expoſitors themſelves confeſs, that *Bertram knew not that the Accidents did ſubſiſt without their ſubjects*. And when they have done all they can by way of Expoſition, they think it neceſſary (u) to expunge all from the beginning of the 73 number, to near the end of n. 77. And again from the beginning of n. 84. to the middle of n. 89. which they ſay, are *Interpolations*; and yet they are as conformable to the Manuſcript, as any thing elſe in the Book. But becauſe they cannot be ſo ex-

(t) *Index Exp.* Philippi *II. Regis Catholici juſſu*, Ant. 1571. *p.* 7.

(u) *Deniq; quædam, quæ videntur non obſcure ab Hæreticis inſerta & aſſuta ſub libri finem. Ibidem p.* 5. *& iterum p.* 6. *Non male aut inconſulte omittantur igitur omnia hæc a ſine pag. Conſiderandum quoq; &c.*

pounded, as to reconcile them with the Real Presence, therefore forsooth, they are *Interpolations* foisted in by some Heretick.

What M. *De Sainte Beuve* said in the Defence of this Tract I know not, nor what Reputation he might get by maintaining a Paradox; but it's plain he made few Proselytes to his Opinion, when the great (w) *de Marca*, Two Years after, father'd it upon *Joannes Scotus*, and said it is the same Book which was condemned in all the Synods against *Berengarius*, and (x) M. *Paris* wrote a Dissertation to support *de Marca*'s Conjecture.

That he tells us, (y) *Since the Manuscripts of it are found, it is that Roman Catholick Divines have judged* Bertram *no Adversary to* Paschasius *or the Church*, is an excellent hint, and we are much obliged to him for it; for it lets us into the Secret, if there be any in the matter. The naked Truth is this: *Ratram* had always

(w) *In Epistola præfixa Tomo Secundo Spicileg. L.* Dacherij.

(x) At the end of M. *Arnaud*'s Defence, in Quarto, *Paris*, 1669.

(y) Pref. p. 10.

main-

maintained the Character of an (z) Orthodox Writer, and is not now to be kicked off as an Heretick. The Manuſcripts now brought to Light, baffle the pretences of Forgery and Corruption, as alſo M. *de Marca*'s Conjecture; and therefore to expound him in a Popiſh Senſe, is the only Game left them to play. As long as there was any colour for ſaying ſo; *Bertram* was an Heretick, or the *Book Spurious*, or at leaſt *grievouſly Corrupted* by the Proteſtants. But now all theſe Shifts fail them upon appearance of the Manuſcripts; he is grown on a ſudden a very Catholick Writer. I profeſs, that it is beyond my reach to comprehend the Reaſons, Why the ſight of the Manuſcripts, ſhould alter any man's Judgment touching the Orthodoxy of *Bertram*. The Printed Copies differ very little from that which Doctor *Boileau* now gives us from the *Lobez* Manuſcript, which is not without ſome Faults, not committed in the old Editions; and they differ not at all in thoſe places which the *Bel-*

(z) Pref. p. 4. *Un Eſcrivain tres-Catholique.*

gick Censors, and *Espenceus* suspect to have been inserted by the Hereticks. So that it is *pure Necessity*, and not any *new Light* which they have received from the Manuscripts, which makes the French Doctors now contend for an Author, whom their Predecessors rejected. If the Roman Catholick Divines had formerly entertained that good Opinion of *Bertram* in M. S. the World had not waited till F. *Mabillon* obliged us therewith, for a Transcript of the *Lobez.* MS. (a) *Antonius Sanderus* in his account of the MSS. in the *Belgick* Libraries, mentions this very Book, (b) from a Printed Catalogue taken near 50 Years before F. *Mabillon* found it. And the President (c) *Mauguin* in the Year 1648. procured a

(a) Ant. Sanderi Biblioth. Belgica MS. par. 1. p. 303. Quarto Insulis 1641.

(b) Juxta exemplar Duaci 1629. in Octa. licet suppresso loci & Typographi nomine. p. 304.

(c) Vide Præf. ad vet. Auctores. IX. Sæculi. Libri *Ratramni* ex M. S. Codice *Cœnobij Lobbiensis*, cujus Authenticum exemplar cura Doctoris *Lovanienſis* & R. P. Lucæ Dacherij consecuti sumus. Vide etiam Testimonium Notarij pub. ad calcem utriusq; libri.

Copy

Copy of his two Books of Predeſtination, which immediately follow this Tract in the ſame Volume, by the favour of a *Louvain Doctor*, and *M. d' Achery*, who cannot be preſumed ignorant of its being there. I ſay nothing of the Manuſcript ſeen by (d) Cardinal *Perron*, without operating any change in his Judgment of the Author, whom he abandons as an Heretick [and a crafty one too] that conceals his [Heterodox] Opinions under Catholick Terms and Expreſſions. So that if the Sorboniſts at preſent have better thoughts of this Tract, its Author owes them very little thanks for that Favour.

Let us now conſider what is offered to make good the Affirmative; *viz.* That *Ratram*'s Adverſaries held,

1. That *there is no Figure in the Holy Euchariſt, but that the Body of our Saviour was expoſed naked to our Corporal Senſes.*

(d) Le Cardinal du *Perron*, qui a ete perſuade que ces Manuſcrits etoient veritablement conformes a l'imprime —— n'a pas laiſſe de l'abandonner comme un Auteur Heretique, qui cache ſes penſees ſous des termes & des expreſſions Catholiques. Preface, p. 10. 11.

2. That *what our Senses perceive therein* [that is, the Accidents of Bread and Wine] *are the self same Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, Crucified*, &c.

For proof of the former, he cites our (*e*) Author in the Preface to the King, n. 2. and in the state of the first Question, n. 5. making them to deny, that *the Body of Christ, and his Blood* (*f*) *are under any Figure or Vail*; and to say that the Sacrament *is pure and simple manifestation of the Truth*; which was not the sentiment of *Paschase*, or the Church of *Rome*, who teach as expressly as *Ratram* himself, that there is a Figure in the Sacrament. If you demand who these Divines were, He tells you (*g*) of one *Abbadus*, and *Walter* Prior of Saint *Victors* in the Twelfth Century, adding, (*h*) *That this Opinion seems to have been common in the Year* 1059. *when* Berengarius *made his Recantation*: And in regard Opinions do not grow

(*e*) Preface, p. 22.

(*f*) Remarks, p. 207. & 215. upon n. 2. 5. & 9.

(*g*) Preface, p. 34. & Remarks on n. 2.

(*h*) Remarks, p. 213. 214.

com-

common on a ſudden, it may be reaſonably thought, that theſe were the Sentiments of ſome in the times of *Ratram*; and that as much is intimated by *Paſchaſe*, in his Book of the *Lord's Body and Blood*, in the Twentieth Chapter. This is all that I can find, either in his Preface or Remarks that looks like a Proof; how little it concludes ſhall preſently be ſhewn.

Thoſe Paſſages which are cited do not neceſſarily infer *an abſolute denial of any kind of Veil or Figure* in the Holy Sacrament, but that his Adverſaries denied ſuch a Figure or Vail, as *Ratram* and the Ancient alwaies acknowledged therein, *viz.* ſuch a Figure as was a Corporeal Subſtance, as the Water in Baptiſm is. The *Pelagians* are charged by the Orthodox Fathers, as Adverſaries of the Doctrine of Grace, though they did not utterly deny Grace, (*i*) but advanced ſuch a Notion of it, as amounted to no more than the Illumination of the Mind by God's Spirit. Whereas the Catholicks did further acknowledge

(*i*) Vide Pelagium citante Auguſt. de Gratia Chriſti, lib. 1. c. 7.

its

its powerful Sway over our Wills, and its assistance in every good Work. Now if *Paschasius* and his Party do in Words acknowledge a Sign or Figure, but such as in effect is none; *Ratram* might well enough charge them with denying any Vail or Figure in the Sacrament.

Bertram and (*k*) *Isidore*, cited by him, make Sacramental Figures to be *res corporales*, Corporal Things; not only the proper Accidents of a Body, as the Figure and Taste of Bread and Wine (which *Paschase* and *Haymo* both admit in the Sacrament) but *Corporal Substances*. And in the Holy Eucharist (*l*) *Ratram* saith, That *Christ's Spiritual Body and Blood are under the Vail of Corporeal Bread, and Corporeal Wine*, which are Bodily Substances: He also saith of the Conse-

(*k*) Quæ ob id Sacramenta dicuntur quia sub tegumento *corporalium rerum* Virtus Divina Secretius Salutem eorundem Sacramentorum operatur. n. 46.

(*l*) Sub velamento *corporei Panis, corporeiq; Vini*, &c. n. 16.

See Numb. 97. 98.

crated

crated (m) *Bread and Cup, which is called Christ's Body and Blood, that it is a Figure of Christ's proper Body:* That the *Body and Blood of Christ* received in the Church are *Figures*, as they are *Visible Creatures*. Whereas (n) *Paschase* contends, that the Consecrated Elements are both a Figure, and the Truth; as Christ who is true God, is stiled (o) *the Figure or Character of his Substance.*

This *Haymo* (although he teacheth a Real Presence of Christ's natural Body) look'd upon as absurd, saying that nothing can be a Figure or Sign of it self; and upon that account de-

(m) Corpus & Sanguis Christi quæ Fidelium ore in Ecclesia percipiuntur Figuræ sunt secundum *visibilem Speciem*. Which is expounded by *Visibilem Creaturam*, in four Lines after, n. 49.

(n) Lib. de C. & S. D. c. 4. Est autem figura vel character hoc quod exterius sentitur, sed totum veritas & nulla adumbratio, quod intrinsecus percipitur.

(o) Heb. 1. 3.

nied

nied (p) *The consecrated Elements to be Signs of Christ's Body*. Nor will the Text cited by *Paschase* bring him off, for in the (q) Original Christ is said to be the Figure of his *Person*, not his *Substance*; and the Vulgar Interpreter must mean *Subsistence*, by *Substantia*, or he was an *Arian*. For the Son was the Image, not of the Essence, but the Person of the Father; and consequently Christ was not truly the Father, though truly God; so that the same thing is not proved to be both a Figure and Truth. I confess *Paschase* expounds the Words of Christ's Human Nature, which tho' it clear him of *Arianism*, yet it spoils his proof, that a thing may be a Figure of it self.

Upon reading his Book with the best attention I was able, I cannot say whether he deny the Substance of

(p) Panis ille Sacratus & Calix signa dicuntur. Non autem hoc quantum ad carnem Christi & Sanguinem accipiendum est. Jam enim Corpus & Sanguis Christi non essent. Nullum enim Signum est illud cujus est Signum: Nec res aliqua sui ipsius dicitur Signum, sed alterius. Apud *Mabill.* A. B. S. 4. p. 2. Præf. n. 93.

(q) It is Χαρακτὴρ ἡ ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ the

the Consecrated Elements to remain, or not; he is so inconsistent with himself, and seems rather to be for *Impanation*, than *Transubstantiation*. But our Adversaries believing his Doctrine to be the same with that of the present Church of *Rome*, which is, that *meer Accidents remain* to be a Figure or Vail of Christs natural Body, he and they are as justly chargeable with denying any Figure, as the *Fancied* Predecessors of *Abbadus* and *Walter*; nay as those Authors themselves, who only asserted that Christ's very Body [not the Accidents only] was sensible, and sensibly broken, but never denied that the Accidents, or somewhat which made the same Impressions on Sense, as did the Accidents of Bread and Wine before Consecration, shrowded it from their Eyes. Whether those Accidents were subjected in Christ's Body, or only environed it; or whether God miraculously Imprinted the Idea of them on the Organs of Sense, the case is no way varied: For the Natural Body of Christ is still covered from the outward Senses, so that what is pretended, could not be the Point in Dispute between *Ratram* and

his

his Adverſaries, who muſt needs admit a Figure and Vail in the Holy Euchariſt, as the Roman Catholicks now do.

2. A right Underſtanding of the Terms of the Queſtion, will clear the Truth of what I ſaid laſt, and overthrow M. *Boileau*'s Fancy. In the Queſtion there are three Parts to be conſidered. 1. (r) The Subject of it, which is comprized in theſe words [That which the Faithful do in the Church receive with the Mouth] which import ſomewhat more than the bare Accidents or Superficies of Bread and Wine, *viz.* the Subſtance which they environ, and which paſſeth into the Mouth with them. 2ly. A thing admitted by both Parties touching this Subject, *viz.* *That by Conſecration it is made Chriſt's Body and Blood.* 3ly. The point remaining in debate, which is, *in what man-*

(r) Subjectum, Quod in Eccleſia ore fidelium ſumitur.

Suppoſitum, Quod Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti fiat.

Quæſitum, An hoc fiat in Myſterio an in Veritate.

ner,

ner, and *by what ſort of change it is made Chriſt's Body and Blood*; whether by a true and natural change, or only by a *Myſtical and Sacramental change*. There is a great Emphaſis in the Word *Fiat*, which is more than a bare Verb Subſtantive in the Queſtion, and imports *a change made*. (*s*) *Ratram* proves againſt his Adverſaries that it was a *Figurative* and *Myſtical*, not a *Subſtantial* and *Corporal change*; and *Haymo* (*t*) who was of the contrary Opinion, makes the Elements to be converted into Chriſts Body and Blood, not *Figuratively*, or *Myſtically*, but *in Verity*; ſo that if *Haymo* were, as F. *Mabillon* (*u*) ſuppoſes the Adverſary whom our Au-

(*s*) At quia confitentur & Corpus & Sanguinem Dei eſſe, nec hoc eſſe potuiſſe, niſi *facta in melius commutatione*, neq; iſta commutatio Corporaliter ſed Spiritaliter facta ſit, neceſſe eſt jam ut *figurate facta eſſe* dicatur. *Ratr.* n. 16.

(*t*) Idem Panis in Carnem Domini mutatur, & idem Vinum in Sanguinem Domini transfertur non per figuram neq; per umbram, ſed per Veritatem. *Haymo*, Hom. in Evang. die S. Palmarum. Item in 1 Cor. 11. eadem habet prope ad verbum.

(*u*) A. B. S. 4. p. 2. n. 93.

thor

thor diſputes againſt, on the firſt Queſtion, *Ratram* as expreſly denies the Real Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Body in the Holy Euchariſt, as *Paſchaſe*, or *Haymo* can aſſert it.

I confeſs he explains *Verity* by *Manifeſtation*, and makes them to ſay, that the Object of their Faith was alſo perceived by the bodily Eye; but their meaning muſt only be, that what they ſaw upon the Altar, was truly, certainly, and without any Trope the Lord's Body. *Manifeſtation* doth not neceſſarily import the *Senſible Evidence* of a thing, but rather its *certain Truth*: And accordingly it is uſed in this Senſe by our Author in another Work, (*w*) where expounding *Iſidores* words, "Who "are predeſtinated to Life, and who "to Death *is uncertain*, expreſſeth it thus; "It is not comprehended by

(*w*) Ratramn. de Præd. lib. 2. p. 77. Apud Mauguin. Qui vero ad illum, quive ad iſtum pertineant finem, in hac mortalitatis caligine, *nulla veritatis manifeſtatione* comprehenditur. Verba *Iſidori* ſunt ſupra. *Incertum* tamen eſt ad quem ſint Finem Prædeſtinati.

any

"any *manifestation of the Truth.* But more of this when I come to consider how M. *Boileau* expounds the Controverted Terms of our Author.

3. Let us for once admit (though it be false) that the Writers whom he names, did in the Twelfth Century hold the Opinion which he pretends our Author to have confuted. How doth this infer, that any body held it in *Bertram*'s daies, neer 300 Years before? This sort of Reasoning is a little of kin to the Logick of that *Oxford* Alderman, who said, *That if they could prove that King* Henry *the Eighth, Reigned before King* Henry *the Sixth, the City would carry their cause.* It is true, he adds, That this was a common Opinion in the middle of the Eleventh Century, when *Berengarius* made his first Recantation; and that Opinions do not grow common all on a sudden: I hope he doth not think it was the Opinion of Pope *Nicolas* II. and the Council who ordered *Berengarius* to recant in that Form; if he does, it's a shrewd Reflection on the Pope's Infallibility. But suppose it were then commonly believed; cannot an Opinion grow common under 200 Years? Did not

Gnoſticiſm, and the *Millenary* Opinions grow common in a much ſhorter time? Did not *Arianiſm* overſpread the World in leſs than 40 Years? Nay are not the Doctrines of *Molino*, grown common in 7 Years ſpace?

There is nothing in that Chapter of *Paſchaſe*, like the Sentiments which he would fix upon *Ratram*'s Adverſaries, and one of the Paſſages to which he refers, *viz.* That the Sacrament is digeſted and paſſeth into the Draught, is preciſely *Ratram*'s own Doctrine, and he argues thence, That what is Orally received is not Chriſt's Natural Body.

The Truth is, the Opinions of *Abbaudus* and *Walter* plainly point out their Original: The Diſpute about the breaking of Chriſt's Body, ſprung from that beaſtly form of Recantation impoſed upon *Berengarius*, by Pope *Nicolas* the II. of which the Romaniſts themſelves were afterwards aſhamed; and neither *Nubes Teſtium* nor *Conſenſus Veterum* think it convenient to be cited among their Teſtimonies for Tranſubſtantiation. The Pope and

Car-

Cardinal *Humbert* (x) reſolving to make it full enough, quite over-did the Buſineſs; for they made him profeſs it as the Faith of the Pope and Council, That Chriſt's Body is *Senſibly and Truly (and not only Sacramentally) handled and broke by the Prieſt's hands, and ground by the Teeth of the Faithful.*

When the Council was over, and the Recantation came to be ſcanned; ſome who were too much (y) Divines

(x) Ore & corde profiteor de Sacramentis Dominicæ Menſæ eam fidem tenere quam Dominus & venerabilis Papa *Nicolaus*, & hæc Sancta Synodus —— tenendam tradidit —— ſcilicet Panem & Vinum quæ in Altari ponuntur, poſt conſecrationem, non ſolum Sacramentum, ſed etiam verum Corpus & Sanguinem Domini Noſtri J. C. eſſe, & ſenſualiter, non ſolum Sacramento, ſed in veritate, manibus Sacerdotum tractari, frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri. Apud Gratianum. de Conſecr. Diſt. 2. c. 42. Ego *Berengarius.*

(y) *Abelardus* and others. Vide Sequentiam in Feſto Corp. Chriſti in Miſſali Rom.

Fracto demum Sacramento,
Ne vacilles, ſed memento
Tantum eſſe ſub Fragmento,
Quantum toto tegitur.
Nulla rei fit ſciſſura,
Signi tantum fit Fractura,
Qua nec ſtatus nec ſtatura
Signati minuitur.

to believe the natural Body of Christ capable of Fraction, or Division, said it was broken and chew'd *in Sacramento, non in Re*; in the Signs only, *viz.* the Accidents and outward Forms of Bread: Others, as (z) *Abbaudus* and *Walter* were for adhering to the Letter of the Council, and were too much Philosophers to believe Accidents could subsist without a subject; and they "contended that "our Saviours Body under those Ac- "cidents was broken truly; and said "that if it were not really broken, it "was not really his Body: So that to "say, that the breaking affected on- "ly the Species, or abstracted Qua- "lities, was to revive the Heresie of "*Berengarius*.

This is the true Pedigree of the Disputes about the breaking of Christ's Body, which cannot be deriv'd from any greater Antiquity, than the Roman Synod, *A. D.* 1059.

This is more than enough to confute all that M. *Boileau* offers to prove,

(z) See their Words cited by M. *Boileau*, in his Preface, p. 36. And in the Remarks, p. 210. 211, 212, 213, 215.

that

that *Ratram*'s Adverſaries believed *no Figure in the Holy Sacrament.* Let us next ſee how he proves, that the Opinion encountred by him in the Second part of this Tract, was not the Opinion of *Paſchaſe*, but of ſome body (he knows not who) that held the *Senſible part of the Holy Euchariſt*, or the Accidents of Bread and Wine, *to be the ſame Body which was Born of the Virgin*, &c.

Truly, for the Proof hereof, he miſrepreſents the Subject of the Queſtion, as though it were only concerning *the Senſible Qualities of what is received* in the Holy Sacrament; whereas it is touching *the Thing orally received*: Then he refers us to his Tranſlation and Remarks, which we ſhall conſider in their proper place. And in the beginning of his Preface, he ſets aſide the Teſtimony of *Cellot*'s Anonymus, who tells us, That *Ratram* and *Rabanus*, both oppoſed *Paſchaſe* in this Point, tho' the Truth of what he aſſerts be notorious, from the expreſs Words of both thoſe Writers. And the Words of *Rabanus* are ſo Emphatical, that although

I have already (*a*) produced them, I cannot but repeat them here, and add ſome few remarks to ſhew, how fully, and directly they contradict the Popiſh Notion of the Real Preſence of Chriſts Body in the Holy Euchariſt. His words are theſe; (*b*) *Some of late entertaining falſe Sentiments touching this Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, have ſaid, That this very Body and Blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *in which our Lord ſuffered on the Croſs, and roſe from the Grave, is the ſame* [Body] *which is received from off the Altar; againſt which Errour*, &c. I hence obſerve,

1. That the Opinion cenſured by him, is the expreſs Doctrine of *Paſchaſe*, and the *Roman Church* at this day. Nor is there any colour for M. *Boileau* to ſay, That he cenſured men

(*a*) Differt. c. 6.

(*b*) Quidam nuper de ipſo Sacramento Corporis & Sanguinis Domini, non rite ſentientes dixerunt hoc ipſum Corpus & Sanguinem Domini, quod de *Maria* Virgine natum eſt, & in quo ipſe Dominus paſſus eſt in cruce, & reſurrexit de Sepulchro, idem eſſe quod ſumitur de Altari; cui errori, &c. Rhabani. Ep. ad Heribald. ad calcem Reginonis, c. 33.

who

who held the Accidents to be Chriſts Body; for he ſpeaks of the *Body received from the Altar*, which he will not deny to be ſomewhat beſides the ſenſible Figure and Accidents of the conſecrated Elements.

2. He cenſures this Opinion, as a *Falſhood, and Error*, againſt which he had purpoſely written.

3. He condemns it as *a late Opinion*; ſo that it had not *Antiquity* to plead.

4. He repreſents it as no *Univerſal Opinion*, but as the Sentiments of ſome few.

(c) So that in ſhort, the Doctrine which was made an *Article of Faith* in the Eleventh Century, was in the Ninth Century not ſo much as a *Probable Opinion*, but rejected by *Rabanus* as a *falſe Novel*, and *private Opinion*, and by no means the *Ancient*, *Catholick*, and *True Belief* of Chriſt's Church.

If Mr. *Boileau* could produce any Piece of the Ninth Century, wherein

---

(c) 1. Quidam, *non* omnes ubiq;.
2. Nuper, *non* ſemper.
3. Non rite ſentientes, *ergo* erronei.

the Propoſition cenſured by *Rabanus* and *Ratram*, is expounded as it is by him, or that contradicted *Cellot's* Anonymus, we would readily yield the Point in Diſpute. But that without any proof, nay againſt ſo notorious Evidence, and ſo expreſs a Teſtimony, he ſhould hope to obtrude upon us, his own Chimera's touching the Deſign and Adverſaries of *Bertram* in this Book, argues a degree of Confidence unbecoming a Divine of his Character.

F. *Mabillon* (*d*) hath more Ingenuity and Diſcretion than to attempt it; and frankly confeſſeth, that both theſe Writers did diſpute againſt *Paſchaſe*, though to ſalve all again, he pretends that they believed the Real Preſence, as much as he did, that they differed only in Words, not in Doctrine; ſo that it was rather a Verbal than a Real Controverſie. But by this Learned Fathers leave, the

(*d*) A. B. S. 4. p. 2. Præf. n. 56. Rabanum, Ratramnum, Anonymum, Herigerum, alioſq; ſiqui ſint, Paſchaſii Adverſarios in reali Chriſti corporis in Sacramento præſentia, cum ipſo conveniſſe, & contentionem hanc in vocum pugna ſitam fuiſſe.

dif-

difference appears much more weighty; *Paſchaſe* and his Adverſaries are at as wide a diſtance, as Proteſtant and Papiſt; and of this the Reader will be ſatisfied upon peruſal of the Fifth Chapter of my Diſſertation; wherein I have ſet down the Doctrine of *Paſchaſe* and the Church of *Rome*, together with *Ratram*'s contrary Doctrines; and have from the Author himſelf ſhewn, in what Senſe he hath uſed thoſe Terms which ſeem proper to eſtabliſh Tranſubſtantiation, but really overthrow it; and this without the help of thoſe new and bold Figures, which M. *Boileau* hath been forced to invent.

Hitherto I have been detecting the weakneſs of thoſe Arguments which this Doctor makes uſe of, to prove his Paradox, that the Doctrine of *Ratram* is conformable to that of *Paſchaſe*, and the Faith of the Church of *Rome*.

I ſhall now offer ſome few Reaſons that convince me of the contrary.

1. It is a juſt and ſtrong Preſumption of this Authors being againſt them, that for above 120 Years together after his firſt appearance in Print, their moſt eminent Doctors

Doctors have with one conſent yielded the Point. I will not except his *Lovain* Friends, whoſe Expedient to make him Orthodox, is with good Reaſon by M. *Alix* declared impracticable, ſince the appearance of Manuſcripts; for they juſtifie thoſe paſſages to be Genuine, which the *Lovain* Divines would have expunged as ſpurious Mixtures. If *Bertram* be ſo full and conſiderable a Witneſs of the perpetuity of their Faith, touching the Preſence of Chriſt in the Holy Sacrament, How comes it to paſs, that their Supream Judge of Controverſies hath treated him as a Knight of the Poſt?

The Doctors of the Church of *Rome* in former daies, were not unacquainted with the Art of Expounding, which is now practiſed with ſo much applauſe, but have ſhewn themſelves much greater Maſters in it, than M. *Boileau*, and have uſed it with greater dexterity, for evading the Teſtimonies produced out of other Fathers by our Divines againſt Tranſubſtantiation. Nor can we doubt but that they were bred under the ſtrongeſt Prepoſſeſſions and Prejudices for the Real Preſence, and conſe-

ſequently as well diſpoſed to underſtand all the obſcure and harſh Paſſages of this Book, in the ſenſe of their own Church, if the Words could poſſibly have born it. If it be now ſo plain, as (e) *M.* Dean of *Sens* would have it thought, That *Bertram* wrote neither againſt the *Stercoraniſts*, nor the *Real Preſence*: If the very reading of the Book be ſufficient to convince a man thereof; How came it to paſs, that ſo many Popes and Cardinals, with other eminent Prelates and Doctors have conſpired in the Condemnation of ſo Uſeful and Orthodox a Work? To paſs a (f) *Sentence quite contrary to its merit; and ſuch as no man, who had well examined it, could reaſonably have expected*? Did they condemn it without Examination? Then God preſerve us from ſuch Judges. Did they not underſtand the Book? Or did they want Skill to try it by the Roman Standard? For my part I cannot think ſo meanly of the *Trent* Fathers, who were employed to cenſure Books, and who com-

(e) *Nous avons ſon livre il ne faut que le lire, Pref. p.* 24. 25.
(f) *Pref. p.* 5.

poſed

poſed the *Index*. What pity was it, that no Artiſt of that time, could furniſh thoſe Fathers with a pair of M. *Boileau*'s Spectacles!

F. *Mabillon* (*g*) tells us, that *Bertram* is not placed in the firſt Claſs of the *Index*, which conſiſts of condemned Authors, but in the ſecond Claſs in which the Works of Catholick Writers, containing falſe or ſuſpected Doctrine, are prohibited; ſo that nothing can be hence concluded againſt the *Soundneſs of his Doctrine*, but only that ſome harſh and obſcure Sentences, rendred *it ſuſpected*.

To this I Anſwer;

1. That nothing appears in the Cenſure, by which we can learn that the Book was prohibited only for *Suſpected Doctrine*, and not for *unſound Doctrine*; which is alſo aſſigned as the Reaſon why ſome Books of Catholick Divines are rejected.

(*g*) A. B. Ubi ſupra n 126. At cum hæc claſſis contineat libros, *qui propter Doctrinam, quam continent non ſanam aut Suſpectam* —— rejiciuntur —— nihil inde in Ratramni fidem inferri poteſt, niſi quod ob duriores quaſdam & obſcuriores ſententias, *ſuſpectam Doctrinam* viſus eſt continere.

2. If

2. If the Cenſors of Books had only rejected *Bertram* for the Obſcurity of his Expreſſions, or Suſpicious Doctrine, and not for falſe and unſound Doctrine, why might they not have allowed him (as they have done others in the ſame Claſs) the favour of a Temporary Prohibition (*b*) *donec corrigatur*, till he be corrected, or explained? I fear thoſe Fathers deſpaired of ſoftning his harſh Expreſſions into any tolerable Catholick Senſe.

3. If we may judge of the Senſe of the Pope, who publiſhed the *Index*, and the Council, which ordered it to be made, by the Judgment of the moſt eminent Doctors in and ſoon after that time, we muſt believe that Falſe and Heretical Doctrine was the fault, which the *Trent* Cenſors found with it. *Sixtus Senenſis*, who wrote within three Years after the Council was diſſolved, calls it (i) *a pernicious Book of Oecolampadius, againſt the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body*. And

(*b*) *Vide Indicem in Claſſe* 2. B.

(*i*) *Perniciоſum Oecolampadii volumen ——— invulgarunt ſub titulo* Bertrami. *Sixtus Sen. in Præf. Biblioth. 5.*

faith,

ſaith, (k) That he wreſts St. *Auſtin*'s Expoſition of theſe words, *I am the Living Bread*; to the Sacramentarian Hereſie, making *the Holy Euchariſt to be nothing elſe but Bread and Wine in ſubſtance, bearing a Figure and Reſemblance together with the Name of Chriſt's Body, which is not truly and corporally preſent, but only in a Spiritual and Myſtical way.* And makes (l) Berengarius *to have revived the ſame Hereſie Two hundred Years after him.* *Eſpenceus*, an Author of the ſame time, points out the very Propoſitions, which ſhew the *Pſeudo-Bertram* (m), as he ſtiles him, *to have been no true Son of the Church, but the Son of a Strange Woman.* (n) *Claudius Sainctes*, who was at the Council of *Trent*, judged the Book *full of Errors and Hereſies*, and therefore ſpurious. *Gregory de Valentia*, (o) tells us that the Book is leaven'd with the

(k) *Aug. Expoſitionem hujus loci* Bertramus ——— *detorquet ad Hæreſin Sacramentariorum*, Lib. 6. *Annot.* 196. *n.* 1. *vide n* 2.

(l) Berengarius — *ducentis pene poſt* Bertramum *annis eandem Hæreſin inſtauravit*, ib. *n.* 6.

(m) *Eſpenceus de ador. Euch. lib.* 2. *c.* 19.

(n) *Vide pref.* p. 8.

(o) Greg. Valen. *Comment Theol.* Tom. IV. *Diſp. VI. Punct.* 3.

Sacra-

Sacramentarian Error, and juſtly [ſure for falſe Doctrine] condemned in the *Trent* Index. And *Poſſevin* (*p*) acquaints us, that notwithſtanding the favourable Judgments of the *Lovain* Divines, *It may by no means be read, ſave by the Pope's ſpecial Licenſe in order to confute it, being utterly Prohibited:* So that it is not for an obſcure Expreſſion, or ſuſpected Propoſition, but for downright Hereſie, that he ſtands condemned.

M. *Boileau* (*q*) confeſſeth, that not only the *Trent* Cenſors, but Pope *Clement* the VIII. with the Cardinals, *Bellarmine*, *Quiroga*, *Sandoval*, and *Alan*, utterly rejected this Book as Heretical. But he gives an incre-

(*p*) *Appar.* T. 1. p. 219. Bertramus. *Prohibitus eſt omnino a* Clem. VIII. *Pont. Max. in poſtremo indice Librorum prohibitorum. Itaque amplius legendus non eſt, niſi quis conceſſus, Sedis Apoſtolicæ, ad refellendos qui ex illo errores aſſeruntur*—— Bertramo *qui Divinum hoc myſterium, haud recte intelligebat neque credebat.*——

(*q*) Preface, p. 8. He might have added *Baronius*, who could not be ignorant of this Work, yet never vouchſafeth to mention it, nor the Author more than once, and that with Diſgrace, as an Adverſary to *Hincmare*, in the Controverſie of Predeſtination.

dible

dible account of their inducement to do ſo, *viz.* That the Proteſtants run them down by the pure dint of Impudence, (r) *They firſt Publiſhed it, they claimed it as favourable to their Sentiments*, and made *Tranſlations of it into* French *to ſerve their own turns*, and they had the fortune *to have their bare word taken*; and thereupon the *R. Cs.* generally rejected it as a pernicious Forgery. Theſe were Candid Doctors indeed, to take an Adverſaries bare word, and let go ſo conſiderable a Champion for the Real Preſence. This was an extraordinary piece of Civility, for thoſe Doctors are not uſually ſo prone to believe us, though we produce Scripture, and Authentick Teſtimonies from the Fathers in proof of our Aſſertions. The firſt Editions of this Book have little appearance of that confidence, we are accuſed of, there were no large Prefaces or Remarks printed with the Text, no Expoſiti-

(r) *Eſtans imprimé par le ſoin des Proteſtants d' Allemagne, comme un ouvrage qu'ils s'imagineront leur eſtre favourable, ils en furent crus ſur leur parole, & preſque tous les Catholiques le rejetterent comme un tres-meſchant livre*, &c. Pref. p. 5. ſee alſo p. 12.

ons

ons or Paraphraſes but plain Tranſlations, for many Years after the *Roman* Doctors had cenſured it, but the naked Text was fairly left to the Readers Judgment. The firſt Publiſhers of our Party, could not poſſibly make a more confident pretence to the favour of *Bertram*, than M. *Boileau* doth, and yet we muſt beg his Pardon, that we cannot return the Civility and give him up to the Church of *Rome* on his bare word.

Whatever motives prevailed with them, it is undeniable, and by M. *Boileau* himſelf confeſſed, that their greateſt Men have judged this Book Heretical; and I ſee no reaſon to believe that *Eſpenceus*, *Genebrard*, and other *Sorbon* Doctors of the laſt Age, were not as competent Judges, whether the Doctrine it contains, be agreeable to the Faith of the Church of *Rome*, as himſelf, M. *le Faure*, and the other Doctors his Approvers. And yet, if after all, the Judgment of ſo many great Prelates and Doctors of the Church of *Rome* muſt ſtand for nothing, and be no prejudice to the Notion of *Ratram*'s Orthodoxy, advanced by Mr. Dean of *Sens*, I think it but a modeſt and equitable requeſt

to him and his Friends, that they make no uſe of the Conceſſion of the *Centuriators*(*s*) who acknowledg in this Author, *the Seeds of Tranſubſtantiation.* Eſpecially when it is remembred that thoſe Authors being *Lutherans* have no power to make Conceſſions for us, and being for Conſubſtantiation, which Doctrine is utterly inconſiſtent with *Ratram*, it was indifferent to them, ſince he was no Friend of theirs, whether they gave him up for a Calviniſt or Papiſt; if their Inclinations were determined one way rather than the other, they muſt be ſtronger to allow him for a Tranſubſtantiator, who agrees with them in the Belief of a Corporal Preſence, than to acknowledg him a favourer of our Sentiments, which are againſt both.

2. A Second Reaſon why we can-

(*s*) As Mr. *Boileau* doth. Remarks on n. 15. and ſome others, citing Cent. IX de Doctrina. *Tranſubſtantiationis habet Semina Bertramus, utitur enim vocabulis* commutationis & converſionis. Non ſequitur. Vide in Diſſertationis noſtræ cap. 5. quo ſenſu his Vocabulis utatur. Centuriatores etiam objiciunt Mabillonius & N. Alexander.

not

not understand this Tract in the Sense of M. *Boileau*, and for Transubstantiation, is because *Ælfric* and our *Saxon* Ancestors, who lived in the Tenth Century, have taught us to understand it in a contrary Sense. And if there be any thing in the Vulgar Plea for Oral Tradition, we may justly expect a better account of the Doctrine of the Ninth Century, the Age immediately before him, and of the true Importance of the controverted Terms and Phrases of this Book from *Ælfric*, than from Mr. *Boileau*, or any interessed Writer of these times.

How large a part of the Saxon Homily for *Easter* day was taken out of this Piece, (*t*) I have shewn before. And as Mr. *Wheelock* (*u*) well observeth from the general Title of the Manuscript, from which he hath Printed it; this Sermon must not be looked upon as the Private Judgment of a

(*t*) Dissert. ch. 3.

(*u*) In notis ad Bedæ l. v. c. 22. p. 462. Liber Catholicorum Sermonum Anglice, in Ecclesia per annum recitandus.

ſingle Doctor, but the publick Doctrine of the Engliſh Church in that Age. Now *Bertram*'s expreſſions are ſo Tranſlated into the Saxon, as renders them incapable of that Paraphraſe which Mr. Dean of *Sens* hath given us.

This I hope to make appear from ſundry Paſſages of the Homily, which now and then upon occaſion, I ſhall crave leave to Tranſlate for my Self, where the Verſion Printed with the Text is too literal, and therefore ſomewhat obſcure.

1. Here is acknowledged (what ſome of our Adverſaries are loth to own, though it is impoſſible to deny it) that there were Controverſies about the Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Holy Euchariſt, in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries. (w) *Men oft have Diſputed, and ſtill do frequently Diſpute, &c.* And the Queſtion was not

(w) Nu ꝛmeadon ȝehpilc men oft and ȝit ȝelome ꝛmeaȝaþ. *Nonnulli ſæpe diſputarunt & etiamnum frequenter diſputant. Male in præſenti* diſputat *per C l.* Wheelock *redditur* ꝛmeadon.

(as

(as M. *Boileau* bears us in hand) whether there be any Figure in the Sacrament? But what is the effect of Consecration, By what sort of change it makes Bread and Wine become Christ's Body and Blood? Whether by a Physical or a Mystical change? And consequently, whether the Holy Sacrament be called the Body and Blood of Christ, in *Propriety of Speech*, that is, in a *Literal*, or *Figurative Sense*? The Words are these:

"How Bread made of Corn, and "Baked with Fire, can be turned in-"to Christ's Body? And how Wine "is by Consecration *turned* into "Christ's Blood? That *Ratram's* first Question, and that here discussed by our Homilist, is one and the same, is apparent from the Answers given by both Authors; and the Instances whereby they explain the Terms *Figure* and *Truth*. And as in the *Saxon*, the Emphasis lies unquestionably on the Word (x) *Turned*; so doubtless in *Ratram* the Word *Fiat* is of the

(x) Hu ȝe hlaꝼ—maȝe beon aꝼenꝺ ꝛo cꝼiꝼꝛeꝼ lichaman oꝺꝺe ꝥ ꝼin-—ꝥeoꝼꝥe aꝼenꝺ, &c. Fol. 30.

like force, and imports the Queſtion to be, By what kind of change the Conſecrated Elements are made Chriſt's Body and Blood? Whether it be by a *Subſtantial*, or only by a *Sacramental* change?

2. As *Ratram* to clear his Diſcourſe, gives us ſuch definitions of a *Figure* and *Truth*, as beſt agree to Figurative and True, that is, proper Forms of Speech. So *Ælfric* premiſeth (*y*) a diſtinction of things attributed to Chriſt, ſome *Figuratively*, and ſome *Truly* and *Properly*. And to expreſs the latter, he uſeth a Word which anſwers to *manifeſtatio*, and *res manifeſta* in *Ratram*, and fully expreſſeth its Senſe in the Explication of the firſt Queſtion, and the Terms above-

---

(*y*) ðuꝼh ȝeꝛacnunȝe ——- ðuꝼh ȝeꝼiꝛꝛum ðinȝe. Fol. 30.

men-

mentioned. The *Saxon* (z) Word ſignifies *certain*, *plain*, or *manifeſt*, and is oppoſed to *Figurative*, and therefore cannot import the *ſenſible Evidence of Things*, as Mr. *Boileau* pretends, but the *plain*, *manifeſt*, and *natural Signification* of Words. The Inſtances both in the Homily and *Bertram*, are an undeniable Proof hereof, and withal give us Light into their Senſe of our Saviours Words, *This is my Body*, which they underſtood not *literally* but *figuratively*; which is what *Ælfric* himſelf meant by *not corporally* but *ſpiritually*, and no doubt in that Senſe he underſtood *Bertram*; and that he was not miſtaken, is evident from num. 74.

(z) Ðuph ȝepiſſum ðinȝe. ȝepiſ Certus, planus, manifeſtus. Somneri Lex. The oppoſition of this term to ȝeᵹacnunȝe directs us in this place, which acceptation to chuſe; as Bread, Lamb, Lion, *&c*, are affirmed of Chriſt in an improper or Figurative Senſe; ſo that he was born of the Virgin, Crucified and roſe again, are affirmed of him in the *plain*, *manifeſt*, and *proper* Senſe of the words.

where the Words *corporally* and *ſpiritually* can be no other Senſe. (a) "As "the Bread is not *corporally* but *ſpi*"*ritually* [that is not *literally* and *pro*"*perly*, but *figuratively*] *ſaid* to be *the* "*body of* the Faithful, ſo is there a ne"ceſſity of *underſtanding* it in the *ſame* "*Senſe* to be the Body of Chriſt. Not corporally SAID to be, *&c.* not corporally UNDERSTOOD, *&c.* can ſignifie nothing elſe, but *not literally* and *properly* affirmed to be the Body of Chriſt, or of the Faithful.

In this Senſe the word Corporally is taken, when it is applied to Terms

---

(a) Sicut non *Corporaliter*, ſed *Spiritualiter* Panis iſte credentium Corpus DICITUR; ſic quoq; Chriſti Corpus non *Corporaliter* ſed *Spiritualiter*, neceſſe eſt INTELLIGATUR. n. 74.

Ælfric ſaith, Fol. 23. that Chriſtians muſt not keep the Old Law lichamlice, corporally, *i. e.* literally. But learn hpæt heo ȝaſtlice tacnie, what it Spiritually ſignifieth, that is, of what Chriſtian Duties it was the Figure. And in this Senſe the Letter and Spirit, and the Fleſh and Spirit are oppoſed each to other by Saint *Paul*.

and

and Propoſitions; but when applied to things, as the Baptiſmal Water, the Conſecrated Elements in the Euchariſt, or the Types of the Old Teſtament, it ſignifies the natural *Subſtance*, by poſitive Inſtitution made a Figure, in oppoſition to its *Sacramental Signification* and *Virtue*; and our Homiliſt calls the *ſpiritual Myſtery*, the *ſpiritual Virtue*, or *ſpiritual Underſtanding* thereof.

3. *Ælfric* ſo expounds *Ratram*, as to make him expreſly deny, that the Holy Euchariſt is Chriſt's Body in *Truth of Nature*, and affirm it to be Bread and Wine after Conſecration. When the Objection is made, "Why "is the Holy Sacrament called Chriſts "Body and Blood, if it be not *Truly* "what it is called? He admits, that the Conſecrated Elements are not in *Verity of Nature* the Body and Blood of Chriſt. Whereas if *Ælfric* had been a Tranſubſtantiatour, he would have denied the Suppoſition, and with M. *Boileau* have ſaid, "The ſenſible part "of the Holy Sacrament, *i.e.* the "Accidents of Bread and Wine are "not Chriſt's Body; they are only "the Vails and Figures that cover it, "but his very natural Body and Blood

"are

"are environed by, and contained "really under those Vails. He would roundly have answered, "That by "Consecration the Substance of "Bread and Wine was substantially "converted into Christ's Body and "Blood; so that nothing of their "Substances, but only the sensible "Qualities and outward Figure of "them remained.

Whereas he saith, that we sensibly discern them in Figure and Tast to be Bread and Wine, and that (*b*) *in spiritual Mystery* they are *truly* Christs Body and Blood, that is, Sacramentally, or in Signification.

Again, he Illustrates the matter by comparing the change made by Consecration in the Eucharist, with a twofold change made in Baptism, neither of which is a substantial change. 1 (*c*) With the change made in the Person Baptised, who is inwardly changed, not in Nature

---

(*b*) ðuꝛh ȝaꝛtlice ȝeꝛýnu, *therefore not in verity of Nature.*

(*c*) Fol. 31. h ꝛ ne bræꝛ na h ꝛ h'ꝑ ꝑiþ uꝛan ðeah ðe hiꝛ beo ꝑiþ innan aꝑenðie. *Inwardly changed.*

or

or Substance, either of Soul or Body, but morally. 2 (*d*) With the change wrought in the Baptismal Water, whose Substance as well as the sensible Accidents is confessed to remain, and which by Consecration only acquires a Sanctifying Virtue. And as he saith of the Water, that in *Verity of Nature* it is a corruptible Liquor: So (*e*) saith he of the Holy Eucharist it is *in kind* or *nature*, *Corruptible Bread and Wine*; distinguishing between the Invisible, or Spiritual Virtue of it, and *the visible Species of its proper Nature*. This latter expression

---

(*d*) ȝelice on hiþ oðrum þæterum. i. e. *Common Water, a corruptible Liquor. So the Eucharist.*

(*e*) Hit is on ȝecynd brosniendlic hlaþ and brosniendlic þin. *In Nature corruptible, and therefore common Bread and Wine.* ȝesepenlican hiþe agenes ȝecyndes; *Fol.* 34. *which is of the same importance with* Substantiæ suæ Species *in* Ratr. de Pred. l. 2. p. 88. On ȝecynd *is Substantialiter, for so it is Translated by* Ælfric, *where* Bertram *saith, That Christ is neither Bread or a Vine, Substantialiter*. n. 8.

con-

confounds the Popiſh Notion of *Speciei*, conjoining the ſenſible Accidents with the Subſtance, upon which *Ælfric* immediately addeth: It is in kind or nature, *corruptible Bread and Wine*, but through the power of the Divine Word, it is truly Chriſt's Body and Blood, yet not corporally, but ſpiritually. The Saxon Word (*f*) ſignifying kind, or nature cannot be perverted as the Latin *Species* is; becauſe, though perhaps it may ſometimes ſignifie the Natural Qualities of a thing, yet it never ſignifies the Image, or Reſemblance of a thing, and much leſs the ſenſible Qualities without their Subject.

Again, he makes (*g*) the Sacrament not to be Chriſt's Body wherein he Suffered, nor his Blood ſhed on the Croſs; but to be his Body and Blood, as the Manna and Rock in the Wilderneſs were; And how is that?

(*f*) ȝecynd.

(*g*) *Fol.* 36. *and Fol.* 44. *He bad them not, to eat the Body,* ðe he mid beſancten pær, *in which he was apprehended, but he meant the Holy Houſel, or Euchariſt.*

(*h*) Not

(*h*) Not *Corporally* Christ, but it signified or was a Type of Christ.

Again, reciting the words of our Saviour spoken to his Disciples, *Ælfric* expounds THIS as signifying *Bread*, which whoever doth cannot understand those words literally, by the confession of our Adversaries. (*i*) Eat THIS BREAD, IT is my Body. Which also *Ratram* in effect doth in those places, which M. *Boileau*, with little reason brags of, for they make against him, where he saith, The *Bread and Cup* which is called, and IS the Body and Blood of Christ. For if Bread and the Cup be the Subject, they cannot be affirmed to be the Body and Blood of our Saviour which was Born of the Virgin; For Bread and Wine were not Born of the Virgin. Nor were they *in rerum natura*, when our

---

(*h*) Fol. 40. Naſ ſe ſtan—— lichamlice Cpiſt ac he ȝetacnode Cpiſt.. *Not Corporally*, i. e. *Not in Substance, or truth of Nature.*

(*i*) Etaþ piſne lilaꝼ: hit iſ min lichama. *This occurs twice, in the Homily* Fol. 28. *and in* Ælfrics *latter Epistle*, Fol. 68.

Savi-

Saviour's Body was broken, and his Blood ſhed for us on the Croſs, and conſequently could not be that very Body. And therefore of two abſurd Opinions, Tranſubſtantiation ſeem'd a leſs abſurdity than Conſubſtantiation, and accordingly the *Romaniſts*, being ſenſible of it, rejected (*k*) *Impanation*, and aſſerted a *Miraculous Converſion*, whereby the ſubſtance of Bread is deſtroyed. Now this *Ratram* in ſeveral places affirms, *viz. That Bread is Chriſt's Body*, but then teacheth us elſewhere in what ſenſe he affirms it is ſo *Figuratively*, it is ſo *Spiritually*; which is the ſame. The like alſo doth *Ælfric* with great Caution, more than once adding, nevertheleſs not ſo *Corporally*, *but Spiritually*; that is, by a Figure. In the ſame ſenſe as the great City where our Lord was Crucified, is ſaid to be *Spiritually* called *Sodom* and *Egypt*, Rev. 11. 8. which all confeſs to be *Figurative*.

(*k*) Which appears to have been the Notion of *Rupertus*, and others, who held a Corporal Preſence; ſee the Preface to a Determination of *Joan. Pariſienſis*.

To

To this I ſhall add as a further evidence of our *Saxon* Anceſtors belief, that the Elements remain in their firſt ſubſtance that the Tranſlator (*l*) of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, calleth the Conſecrated Wine, *Earthly Wine*, which was a voluntary Gloſs, to the uſe whereof the (*m*) the Vulgar Latine gave him no Invitation; and the ſame words are by Tranſlators of the other Evangeliſts rendred literally. The Fathers underſtand our Saviour to ſpeak of the *Conſecrated Wine*, which this Tranſlator would never have called *Earthly Wine*, if he or the Saxon Church had believed it to be the *Natural Blood* of Chriſt, or not believed the ſubſtance of Wine to remain after Conſecration.

4. *Ælfric* all along ſo expreſſeth himſelf, that any Man may ſee, he did not hold the *Subſtance* of Chriſt's Body, and Blood, to be in the Sacrament, but only the *Virtue* and *Efficacy* thereof. This is *Ratram*'s expreſs Doctrine, and reflected on with

---

(*l*) Or þýrum eopþlican þine, Mat. 26. 29.

(*m*) De genimine vitis.

diſplea-

diſpleaſure by *Paſchaſe* (*n*), who profeſſeth to wonder what ſome Perſons meant, who ſaid that the Euchariſt was not in reality Chriſt's true Fleſh and Blood, but *Sacramentally*; the *Virtue* of his Fleſh, not Fleſh, the Virtue of Blood not Blood, a Figure not the *Truth*. Accordingly *Ælfric* when there is occaſion to make an Antitheſis of the *Viſible Sign*, to the *Res Sacramenti*, doth not oppoſe an Inviſible *Subſtance*, or a *Spiritual Body* to the Viſible *Sacrament*, but only an Inviſible *Power*, or *Virtue*. As in Baptiſm, the *Sanctifying Virtue* to the *Corruptible Liquor*. So in the Lord's Supper, he oppoſeth a Spiritual *Virtue* to the Senſible Object, which he calls a Corruptible Creature, adding that there is a vaſt difference between the Inviſible Virtue of the Holy Euchariſt, and the Viſible ſhape of its proper Nature.

And ſpeaking of ſome Mens receiving a bigger piece of the Conſecra-

(*n*) Miror quid velint nunc quidam dicere, non in re eſſe veritatem Carnis Chriſti vel Sanguinis, ſed in Sacramento, Virtutem Carnis, non Carnem, virtutem Sanguinis & non Sanguinem, Figuram & non Veritatem.

ted

ted Bread, and others a leſs, he ſaith the (*o*) *whole Virtue* not *Subſtance* of Chriſt's Body, is as much in the one as the other, and the Virtue being entire in the ſmaller piece, muſt conſequently be equal to the Virtue of the whole Hoſt. This is a very intelligible Notion, That in *Signification* and *Efficacy*, a part may be equal to the whole, eſpecially where it operates as a Moral Inſtrument. But to ſay that in Subſtance or Quantity after infinite Diviſions, the leaſt ſenſible Part ſhould be equal to the whole, is an inſolent Contradiction to the ſtanding Principles of Geometry.

And in ſome places he ſo renders *Bertram*, that the Paſſages which in the Author appear a little favourable to M. *Boileau*'s Expoſition, in *Ælfric*'s Paraphraſe quite ſubvert it, comparing the Sacrament of Baptiſm, with the Holy Euchariſt, having determined that Water in the Former, is in its own nature a corruptible *Liquor*, but in the Sacrament it is an Healing Virtue; ſaith in like man-

(*o*) Ac hiꝛ biþ ðeah phpædeꝛ æꝼ-ꝛeꝛ ꝺaꝼꝛ luꝛe miht on ælcum dæle eall, *Fol.* 36.

ner of the Holy Euchariſt. That outwardly conſidered, the Body and Blood of Chriſt is a corruptible Creature, but if you ponder its Myſtical *Virtue* it is *Life*. M. *Boileau* Tranſlates *Superficie tenus conſiderata*, conſider'd as to its *Exterior Superficies which falleth under Senſe*, on purpoſe to beguile the Reader, and make him believe, that *Bertram* calls the Senſible Accidents only, a corruptible Creature: But *Ælfric* renders *Superficie tenus* (*p*) after bodily Underſtanding, that is, conſider'd *Corporally*, or in its *Nature*, in oppoſition to its Virtue and Beneficial Efficacy. For ſo he expounds himſelf immediately; and that *Ratram* intended not to ſeparate the *Superficies* from its Subject, is I think very evident, from N. 10. (*q*) where he ſaith of the Conſecrated Wine, What do we diſcern elſe in its Superficies, but

---

(*p*) Æfter lichamlicum andgite, *Fol.* 32.

(*q*) Vinum quoque —— aliud Superficie tenus oſtendit, aliud interius continet. Quid enim aliud in Superficie quam SUBSTANTIA VINI conſpicitur, *Ratr. N.* 10.

the

the *Subſtance* of Wine. And ſpeaking of the Baptiſmal Water, he uſeth the like Phraſes, (r) *as it is ſeen by the Bodily Senſe*, it is a corruptible, fluid Element; and again, There is in the Holy Font, that which the *Bodily Senſe* can reach, which is mutable, &c. and yet no Body will pretend, that thoſe Phraſes import no more than the Senſible Accidents of Water without its natural Subſtance.

So then Subſtances are Objects of Senſe, by the good leave of the (ſ) *Defender* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, tho' he Chaſtiſeth his Learned Adverſary, as one who hath leſs Logick than a Junior Soph. for ſaying *that it is a matter of Senſe*, that we diſpute with the *R. Cs.* when we prove the Holy Euchariſt to be Bread and not Fleſh; and for all the Maxims which he gravely lays down againſt it, Subſtances do truly, though not imme-

(r) In eo tamen fonte ſi conſideretur ſolummodo quod *corporeus aſpicit Senſus*, &c. n. 17. Cognoſcitur ergo in eo fonte & ineſſe quod *Senſus corporis attingat* & idcirco mutabile atque corruptibile, n. 18.

(ſ) Tranſubſtantiation defended, *p.* 5.

diately, affect the Organs of Senſe, which are competent Judges of the Eſſential difference of Bodies, by their proper Senſible Qualities. And all this he confeſſeth as ſoon as his Paſſion is a little ſpent.

Again, *Ælfric* teacheth us *Ratram*'s true ſenſe of *Chriſt's Spiritual Body*, and ſhews it to be vaſtly wide of what the *Romaniſts* fancy. For he meant not thereby Chriſt's Natural Body ſubſiſting after the manner of a Spirit, that is, without being Viſible, or Local, and without its proper Dimenſions, under the Viſible forms of Bread and Wine; but on the contrary by Chriſt's Spiritual Body he underſtands the Viſible Sacrament, or conſecrated Bread, which he calls the Holy Houſel, and ſtiles it a *Spiritual Body*, in (*t*) *Origen*'s ſenſe, when he calls it a Typical or Symbolical Body; or, as the Apoſtle calls the Rock in the Wilderneſs, a Spiritual Rock, (*u*) *i. e.* a Typical Rock. To make out this, I need

(*t*) Καὶ, τοῦτο μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ, συμβολικοῦ σώματος. Origen. in Matth. Tom. I. pag. 254. Edit. Huetianæ.

(*u*) 1 Cor. 10. 4.

only

only produce his bare words, where diſtinguiſhing his Body wherein he Suffered from that in the Sacrament, he proves them to be quite different things, becauſe "the former was "born of the Fleſh of *Mary* with "Blood, Bones, Skin, Sinews, di-"ſtinct Limbs, and animated with a "Rational Soul, whereas (w) his "SPIRITUAL BODY which "we call the HOUSEL, is made "up of many Corns, without Blood, "Bone, Limb, or Soul, *&c.* Therefore not as the *Trent* Fathers teach us, the entire Perſon of Chriſt, Body, Soul, and Divinity. It is obvious alſo to remark the ſame thing fairly intimated by him in another place, where expounding theſe words of our Saviour, *He that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, hath everlaſting Life.* He gloſſeth thus after

---

(w) Saxon Hom. fol. 34, 35. hiꝛ ȝaꝛꝛlica lichama þe þe huꝛle haꝛaþ, iꝛ oꝼ maneȝum coꝑnum ȝeȝadeꝑod. Et *Ratramnus*, n. 72. At vero *caro Spiritualis* quæ Populum credentem Spiritualiter paſcit, ſecundum ſpeciem quam gerit exterius, frumenti granis manu artificis conſiſtit. *&c.*

St. *Austine*, (x) *He did not command them to eat that Body in which he was apprehended*, nor to drink that Blood which he shed for us, but he meant the holy HOUSEL by those words, which is SPIRITUALLY his Body and Blood, and proceeds immediately after *Fulgentius* and *Ratram*, to compare the Legal Sacrifices, with this Eucharistical one, and makes the difference principally to consist herein, that the Legal Sacrifices did PREFIGURE Christ TO BE given us, and the HolyEucharist was a commemorative Type, or Memorial of Christ ALREADY given to Die for our Sins. And in *Elfrics* latter Epistle, he saith, that the Consecrated Bread, (y) which he calls *Living Bread*, that it is not Christ's Body in Corporal Substance or Reality, but in a Spiritual, *i. e.* Sacramental or Mystical Sense.

I could add many more Observations from this Homily, and other

---

(x) Liꝼlica hlaꝼ, fol. 69. ȝaꝼtlice huꝼel, fol. 71.

(y) On lichamlican ðinȝe ac on ȝaꝼtlecum andȝyte, fol. 69.

Monu-

Monuments of our *Saxon* Anceſtors, which ſhew that the Tranſubſtantiators, and not we are departed from the Faith of our Anceſtors 700 years ago. As his ſpeaking of (*a*) *pieces of* Chriſt's Body, and (*b*) its growing *black*, *hoary*, or *rotten*, whereas no ſuch diviſion, or ill-favoured Accidents can happen to Chriſt's true Body, and how new Accidents can be generated without a Subject, or be ſubjected in the remaining Accidents of Bread and Wine, is a Phænomenon that tranſcends all Philoſophical Solution. For Conſecration can have no effect on Accidents not exiſting, and which have no relation at all to the Holy Myſtery, and conſequently cannot be preſumed to exempt them from the common Law of Accidents, which neceſſarily require a Subject to ſubſiſt in, whereas theſe are not ſubjected in Chriſt's Body, and how they ſhould be ſub-

---

(*a*) ðeah ꝛume men ȝeꝛceoꝛe læꝛꝛe dæl ne biþ ꝛꝑa maꝑe mihꝛ on ðam maꝑan dæle ðonne on þam læꝛꝛan. fol. 37.

(*b*) Fol. 62. & 65.

jected in other Accidents, *Aristotle* himself would not be able to resolve us.

I shall only add, That had our *Saxon* Ancestors believed the *Housel* to be Christ's Natural and true Flesh, it is incredible, that their Canons should enjoyn fresh Consecrations, every Week or Fortnight at longest, to prevent such Accidents, and that if *(c)* the Housel grew *stale and nauseous*, it should be *burnt in a clear Fire*, and the Ashes buried under the Altar; I say it is incredible that they should order it to be burnt, if they believed it the very Body of our Saviour. I shall trouble the Reader with nothing further, till I come to shew how absurdly Mr. *Boileau*, in his Remarks senseth some terms of *Ratram*, whose

(*c*) Canones sub Edgaro apud Spelman. Concil. Tom. *I.* vide Canon. 38. p. ȝif hiꝛ ꝼoꝛheaden ꝛy þat hiꝛ man bꝛucan ne mæȝe þonne ꝼoꝛbæꝛn hiꝛ man on clænum ꝼiꝛe——— *I* know the *Roman Missal* in some cases injoyns Burning, but not till the Species be wholly corrupted, when in the Judgment of the Schoolmen, Christ's Body and Blood are retired.

true

true meaning the *Saxon* words uſed as equivalent in this Homily will very much illuſtrate.

III. My third Reaſon to ſhew that Mr. *Boileau* hath not given us a true account of the Sentiments and Deſign of *Ratram*, is becauſe his Arguments prove a great deal more, than that there is a Figure in the Sacrament, or that the Accidents are not the Senſible Truth of Chriſt's Body.

The very firſt Inference he makes is this, (*d*) *Hence it is evident, that this Bread and Wine are Figuratively Chriſt's Body and Blood*; which is a great deal more than that there is a Figure in the Sacrament. 1. He ſaith poſitively, that this *Bread and this Wine*, not the Senſible Qualities of them, are Chriſt's Body and Blood. 2. He ſaith they are *Figuratively*, not ſimply and *in propriety of Nature* Chriſt's Body and Blood. Theſe words Mr. *Boileau* hath fraudulently Tranſlated, IN A FIGURE.

(*d*) Claret quia Panis ille Vinumque FIGURATE Chriſti Corpus & Sanguis EXISTIT. n. 10.

Again,

Again, When he hath proved that there is no *Phyſical* change upon Conſecration, neither Generation, nor Corruption nor Alteration, he thence infers (*e*) that of neceſſity it muſt be *Figuratively* changed, which is ſomewhat more than Mr. *Boileau* will acknowledge to have been in diſpute between him and his Adverſaries. For it determines the Nature of the change to be *Figurative*, and if ſo, the Elements are not *Subſtantially* turned into Chriſt's Body and Blood, as the Church of *Rome* hath defined. That a *Figurative* change infers no Subſtantial change in *Ratram*'s Judgment, we may obſerve in his Explication of the words *Figure* and *Verity*, where having ſaid that Chriſt was by a Figure called *Bread*, and *a Vine*; he tells us however (*f*) that Chriſt is not *Subſtantially* either Bread or a Vine, *&c.* And this is in expreſs Terms the Hereſie which

(*e*) Neceſſe eſt jam ut FIGURATE facta eſſe dicatur, ſcil. commutatio. n. 16.

(*f*) Nam SUBSTANTIALITER nec Panis Chriſtus, nec Vitis Chriſtus, nec Palmites Apoſtoli. Quapropter hic FIGURA. n. 8.

Chif-

Chiffler's Anonymous Writer chargeth *Berengarius* with advancing, contrary to the Catholick Faith. He tells us, (*g*) that *Berengarius* taught, that the Conſecrated Bread and Wine was *not Truly and Eſſentially*, but *only in a Figurative manner turned* into Chriſt's Body and Blood. This Author is ſaid to have written *A. D.* 1088. in which year *Berengarius* died, and if he miſrepreſent not his Sentiments, and underſtood what was then eſteemed the Catholick Faith, we have great reaſon to believe; that had *Bertram* ſtood a Trial before the ſame Judges with *Berengarius*, he would have fallen under the ſame Condemnation.

Mr. *Boileau* hopes to excuſe him from aſſerting in the forementioned Expreſſion, that which he takes to be the Doctrine of *Berengarius*, and the Reformed Churches by this ſhift: Saith he, "(*h*) *Ratram* doth not

(*g*) Aſſerens Panem & Vinum in Sacrificio Domini, non VERE & ESSENTIALITER, ſed FIGURATE tantum CONVERTI in Corpus & Sanguinem Dominicum. *Concil. To. IX. col.* 1050. *Edit. Labbei.*

(*h*) Remarks, p. 219. Il ne dit pas qu'ils ſont *ſeulement en Figure* le Corpus de J. C.

"teach,

" teach, that the Holy Euchariſt is " ONLY IN A FIGURE Chriſt's " Body. But this will not ſerve the turn. For, 1. If he intend by adding the word ONLY, to make the Aſſerters of a *Figurative* change, to exclude any Spiritual Efficacy or Grace annexed to this Sacrament, and to own no more than empty Signs, he groſsly abuſeth the Reformed Religion, as may be ſeen by our Confeſſions. No ſober Proteſtant ever affirmed it, nor did *Berengarius*, who with *Ratram* owned a Divine Virtue therein conferring Grace. (*i*) *The Sacrament*, ſaith he, *is Tranſitory, but the Virtue that worketh thereby, and the Grace conferred is eternal.* Yet this Declaration did not ſatisfie the Councils of the XI. Century, nor did it pleaſe *Paſchaſe*, as hath been ſhewn, and the Coun-

(*i*) Sacramentum quidem tranſitorium eſt Virtus vero quæ per ipſum operatur & Gratia quæ inſinuatur, æterna. *Bereng.* in Ep. ad *Ricardum* Conc. Tom. XI. col. 1062. Which words, with thoſe that follow, are aſcribed to *Paſchaſe*, in the Bibl. Patrum Edit. Par. 1610. Tom. VI. col. 296. the order of the Sentences differs, but the words are the ſame.

cil

cil of (k) *Trent* hath Anathematized all ſuch as acknowledge not Chriſt perſonally preſent in the Sacrament, but only in Sign, in Figure, or Virtue.

2. *Ratram* doth in effect ſay, That the Conſecrated Elements are ONLY in Figure and Virtue Chriſt's Body and Blood, becauſe he denies them to be Corporally, or in Nature changed, or to be Chriſt's Body born of the Virgin, *&c.* and affirms them to be the Figures, Pledges, Images, Sacraments of Chriſts true and natural Fleſh and Blood, which are indeed more expreſs Excluſives than the Conjunction ONLY.

I ſhall not here call Mr. *Boileau* to an account, for his ſly and fraudulent Tranſlation of the word (l) *Figurate* in a Figure, in ſtead of *by a Figure*, to inſinuate that *Ratram* held Chriſt's natural Body to be inviſibly under the Forms or remaining Accidents of Bread and Wine, but remember him of it in another place.

(k) ——Sed dixerit tantummodo eſſe in eo, ut in Signo, vel Figura aut Virtute, Anathema ſit. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. XIII. Can. I.

(l) *En Figure* inſtead of *en maniere Figurative*, or *par une Figure*, n.

Again,

Again, The Parallel which *Ratram* makes between the Holy Euchariſt, and Baptiſm, manifeſtly ſhews his intention to prove ſomewhat more than barely, that there is a Figure in the Sacrament. For the Analogy between the two Sacraments lieth in this as Material Water in Baptiſm, without any Phyſical change, hath through the Bleſſing annexed to that Inſtitution by our Saviour, a Spiritual Efficacy and Sanctifying Virtue, which worketh a real effect on the Soul, which reſembleth the cleanſing effect of common Water: So in the Holy Euchariſt, *Material Bread and Wine* do by the ſame means obtain a Spiritual Efficacy and Nutritive Virtue, which Spiritually feeds the Soul, as the Material Bread and Wine nouriſh the Body.

This Mr. *Boileau* (*m*) flatly denieth, but upon very ſlender Reaſons. "For, ſaith he, were this the Au-"thors ſenſe he could not ſay as he "doth, that Chriſt's Body is there, and "that it is a Crime ſo much as to

(*m*) Remarques, p. 226.

"ima-

"imagine the contrary: That there "is in the Sacrament a change of "one thing into another, or that the "Corporal appearances of Bread "and Wine, and Chriſt's Body have "not two ſeveral Exiſtences.

But all this is meer Smoak, and Amuſement. For *Ratram* doth not ſay it is a Crime to think *that the* Conſecrated Elements are not Chriſts NATURAL Body; he ſaith it himſelf twenty times over, and tells us that they are Chriſts SPIRITUAL Body, and the Senſe of the word Spiritual I have already ſhewn. Neither doth he affirm the Sacramental change to be *of one thing into another*; thoſe words are added by way of Paraphraſe, by Mr. *Dean* of *Sens*, as I ſhall ſhew in its proper place. He fairly intimates the contrary, where he tells us, *That it is a change for the better* (*n*), having before proved it to be no Phyſical change, for ſuch an advancement may be made without

(*n*) Nec hoc eſſe potuiſſe niſi facta in melius commutatione, neque iſta commutatio Corporaliter ſed Spiritualiter Facta ſit; neceſſe eſt jam ut Figurate, &c. n. 16.

any

any Subſtantial change, by raiſing the Elements to a Dignity above the condition of their Nature, and ſeparating them from common to ſacred Uſes. As for what he adds that the Corporal appearances, and Chriſts Body, have not two diſtinct Exiſtences, I ſhall when I come to conſider how he abuſeth the word *Species*, ſhew that the Bodily Appearances he ſpeaks of are meer Fiction, never dream'd of by our Author. In the mean time I ſhall give the Authors true ſenſe, which is this: "That there are not two "Conſubſtantiate Beings in the Sa"crament, as in a Man there is a "Soul and Body. but that one and "the ſame thing, *viz.* The Ele"ments conſider'd with reſpect to "their Natural Subſtance *are Bread* "*and Wine*, but conſider'd as *Conſe*"*crated*, they are *Sacraments* of "Chriſt's Body and Blood. This is eaſily illuſtrated by a familiar Example: The King is not two Perſons as he is a Man and a Prince, but one, who conſidered in his Natural Capacity is a Man, and in his Civil Capacity is a Prince.

the

The ſame Inference may be alſo made from *Ratram*'s Parallel of the Holy Euchariſt with Manna, and the Rock Water, which he ſaith were *Spiritually turned* into Chriſt's Body and Blood, and were eaten and drunk by the Faithful *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs. His ſcope is plainly this, to prove that the change made by Conſecration is not Subſtantial, but Figurative, like that of the Manna, which could not be properly Tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt's Body, before his Incarnation, before he had a Body prepared him.

And yet a wanton Wit might in Mr. *Boileau*'s way, as handſomely elude all Arguments againſt *Ratram*'s belief of a ſubſtantial change of the Manna and Water into Chriſt's Body, as he doth our Arguments againſt the Corporal Preſence *from Bertram*.

If he object that *Bertram* ſpeaks of the ſubſtance of Manna and the Water, it is eaſily anſwered, that the word *Subſtantia*, even by the confeſſion of Mr. *Boileau* (*o*), is not always taken in the ſtrict Philoſophical Notion, but ſometimes more

(*o*) Remarques, p. 246, 247.

largely, for the Senſible Qualities of things.

If he urge that *Bertram* calls them Corporal Things, it may be anſwered, that by (*p*) Mr. *B*'s confeſſion, that may ſignifie no more than the External appearance of a Body, and the ſenſible Accidents.

If he further preſs the Impoſſibility of the Thing, that Manna ſhould be ſubſtantially converted into a body not Exiſting: It may be plauſibly replied, That *Bertram* ſaith (*q*), *We muſt not exerciſe our Reaſon, but our Faith in this matter.* It is a Miracle, a Myſtery Incomprehenſible, a Work of God's Omnipotence, which is not to be limited by the pretence of Impoſſibilities and Abſurdities.

In fine, when he comes to determine the firſt Queſtion, and make his Inference from all the Arguments and Authorities which he had before alledged, he concludes thus: (*r*) The Body and Blood of Chriſt orally

(*p*) Remarques, p. 222.

(*q*) N. 25.

(*r*) N. 49. Figuræ ſunt ſecundum Speciem Viſibilem, at vero ſecundum Inviſibilem Subſtantiam, id eſt, Divini Potentiam Verbi vere Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti Exiſtunt.

recei-

received by the Faithful, may be conſidered either as Viſible Creatures, and ſo they are Figures, and feed the Body, or according to *their Inviſible Subſtance*; which is, as he explains himſelf, *The Power of the Divine Word, and ſo they are truly Chriſt's Body and Blood, feeding and ſanctifying the Souls of the Faithful.*

From which Paſſage it is plain, not only that *Ratram* proves a Figure in the Sacrament, but that this Figure is more than the outward appearance of Bread and Wine, that it is the Subſtance, for what he meant by the viſible Species he after explains, by calling them the (*ſ*) Viſible Creature, and affirming that it feeds the Body; and though he oppoſe hereunto the Inviſible Subſtance, the words that follow direct us to take *Subſtance* in an improper ſenſe.

For he delivers himſelf with great Caution, as if it were on purpoſe to prevent any ſuch Miſtake, according to the *Inviſible Subſtance*, (*t*) that

(*ſ*) Viſibilis Species *is Expounded by* Viſibilis Creatura.

(*t*) Inviſibilem Subſtantiam, *by* potentioris Virtutem Subſtantiæ.

is, (ſaith he) the *Power of the Divine Word*; and again, *The virtue of a more Powerful Subſtance*, which is the Grace annexed to the Sacrament, by virtue of the Inſtitution. For that he ſhould hereby mean Chriſt's Natural Body, no Body will believe, who conſiders, that he affirmed (*u*) a *Spiritual Power of the Word*, to have been *in Corporeal Subſtances of Manna and Water*, in which no *R. C.* ever pretended that Chriſt was preſent in verity of Subſtance.

In the ſecond Part, it is as evident that he encounters not that Fictitious Error Mr. *Boileau* would have him, *viz.* That the outward Species, and Senſible Accidents of Bread and Wine, are Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood born of the Virgin, *&c.*

For firſt, The ſubject of the Queſtion is, as hath been already ſhewn, the *Conſecrated Elements*, the *whole Euchariſt as Orally received*, and not their meer Accidents: *For* he ſaith,

(*u*) Inerat corporeis illis Subſtantiis, SPIRITUALIS VERBI POTESTAS, quæ mentes potius quam Corpora credentium paſceret atque potaret, n. 22.

(*w*) The

(w) The ſubſtance of the Creatures remains after Conſecration, what they were before, that is, Bread and Wine. Indeed, if the Subject were only the outward Species, or Accidents of Bread and Wine, I know no need Mr. *Boileau* hath to Tranſlate the word *Veritas*, the *Senſible* verity, as he doth forty times over, where *Ratram* denies that which is orally received to be Chriſt's Natural Fleſh. For the meer Accidents are in no ſenſe Chriſt's Natural Body, *they are in no way* Chriſts Body in verity of Nature, neither the *Senſible* nor yet the *Inviſible* verity thereof.

2. The matter in Queſtion cannot be whether the Holy Euchariſt is Chriſts Body born of the Virgin, in its proper ſtate, with its Senſible Qualities, and Dimenſions, but whether it be his True and Natural Body, which *Paſchaſe* deſcribes as in the Queſtion.

The former could not be the Notion oppoſed by our Author, for be-

(w) Nam ſecundum Creaturarum Subſtantiam, quod fuerant ante Conſecrationem, hoc & poſtea conſiſtunt, Panis & Vinum prius extitere, &c. N. 54.

ſides, that he no where mentions any ſuch Opinion, it doth not any way elſe appear by any Writer, either before or of his time, that ſuch an Opinion was ever embraced, or vented by any Man.

The latter was the Doctrine of *Paſchaſe*, a Doctrine which by his own confeſſion gave offence to many, and that *Ratram* diſputes againſt it, ſeems very clear to any Man who obſerveth, in how accurate Terms he eſtabliſheth an Eſſential Difference, between the Conſecrated Elements and Chriſts Natural Body.

He diſtinguiſheth them as things of vaſtly different Natures, uſing the words *aliud* and *aliud*, ONE THING and ANOTHER THING, THIS Body, and THAT Body, which was born of the Virgin. He teacheth that Sacraments are ONE thing, and the THINGS whereof they are Sacraments are ANOTHER. That Chriſts Natural Body and Blood are THINGS, but the Myſteries hereof are SACRAMENTS. *Num.* 36.

Again, He proves them to differ (I think Eſſentially) becauſe the ſame Definition doth not agree to both.

both. For one of their Canonized Schoolmen teacheth, (*x*) *That even Omnipotence it ſelf cannot ſeparate the Definition, and the thing Defined.*

Again, He calleth the one Chriſts PROPER Body, the other his MYSTICAL Body, *N.* 94, 95. And in a word, he diſtinguiſheth the Euchariſt, from Chriſts Proper Body, in almoſt the ſame words wherein St. *Hierom* (*y*) compares the Shew-bread with the Euchariſt, calling it Chriſts Body, and declaring how much the latter excels the former, *N.* 89. "It appears, ſaith *Ra-*"*tram*, that they are extremely dif-"ferent, as much as the *Pledge* dif-"fers from the *Thing* for which it is "*given in Pledge*, as much as the "*Image* differs from the Thing "whereof it is the Image, as much as "a *Figure* from the *Truth*: And if the words do not effectually import an Eſſential Difference, it's hard to deviſe words that can do it.

(*x*) *Bonav.* in Sent. 14. Diſt. 10. p. 1. q. 4.

(*y*) Tantum intereſt inter Panes Propoſitionis & Corpus Chriſti, quantum inter umbram & Corpora, inter Imaginem & Veritatem, inter Exemplaria & ea quæ præfigurabantur, *Hier. in Titum, Cap.* 1.

In a word, the Scope of all his Arguments and Authorities, is to prove ſuch a Difference between the Holy Euchariſt, and our Saviours Natural Body. And in the cloſe of the Book, when he ſums up the force of all his Reaſonings, and comes to determine the Point, he concludes thus.

"(*a*)From theſe Teſtimonies of the "Holy Scriptures and Fathers, it is "moſt evidently demonſtrated, that "the Bread and Cup, which are cal-"led the Body and Blood of Chriſt "are a FIGURE, becauſe they are "a Myſtery, and that there is NO "SMALL DIFFERENCE between "the BODY which is ſo MYSTI-"CALLY, and the BODY that "SUFFERED, *&c.* For this lat-"ter is the PROPER BODY of "our Saviour, nor is there any FI-"GURE, or Signification therein, "but the very manifeſtation of the "thing it ſelf —— (*b*) Whereas in "the Body which is celebrated by a "MYSTERY, there is a FIGURE, "not only of Chriſt's PROPER "BODY, but alſo of the People

(*a*) N. 97. (*b*) N. 98.

who

"who believe on Chriſt: For it "bears a FIGURE of BOTH "BODIES.

"(*c*) Moreover, That Bread and "Cup which is called, and is Chriſts "Body and Blood, repreſents the "Memory of the Lords Paſſion, *i. e.* "(as he explains himſelf in the next "Number) (*d*) they are placed on "the Altar for a FIGURE or "MEMORIAL of the Lord's "Death.

And leſt his Adverſaries ſhould miſrepreſent his Doctrine, as though he taught *that Chriſts Body and Blood were not received by the Faithful*, but a *meer* Memorial, and Figure of them (as the *Romaniſts* ſlander the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches) he (*e*) cloſeth all with a caution againſt any ſuch Inference, adding that *Faith receives not what the Eye beholds, but what it ſelf believes, for it is Spiritual Meat, and Spiritual Drink, which do ſpiritually feed the Soul.* Which words, if Mr. *Boileau* take to be a Declaration in favour of their Real Preſence, I ſhall the leſs wonder, ſince our Adverſaries at Home have the confi-

(*c*) N. 99. (*d*) N. 100. (*e*) N. 101.

dence

dence from ſuch Apologies of our own *Divines*, to infer that they and the Church of *England* are for their REAL PRESENCE.

Having thus ſhewn how Mr. *Boileau* either groſsly miſtakes, or wilfully miſrepreſents the Authors Deſign in the account he hath given, I ſhall now proceed to take a view of his Tranſlation.

Now this Book of *Ratram*'s being a Theological Controverſie, whoſoever ſhall undertake to turn it into any other Language, ought to employ his utmoſt care in truly expreſſing the Authors Senſe, and as much as the Language will bear it, in his own words. He may not take thoſe liberties of Paraphraſe, which are allowable in the Tranſlator of a Poem, or a Piece of Hiſtory or Morality. He may not to adorn his Verſion, or ſmooth his Stile, *add*, *omit*, or *change*, a word; for the Nature of the Subject forbids it. And moreover Mr. *Boileau* hath obliged himſelf to obſerve the ſtricteſt Laws of Tranſlation, having profeſſed to have made this Verſion with all poſſible exactneſs, and brought ſeveral of his Brethren of the *Sorbon* to al vouch-

vouch its conformity to the Author's Text. He is ſevere upon (*f*) M. *Dacier*, and the *Proteſtant* Tranſlator of *Bertram*, for taking as he conceives undue Liberties. He will not allow the (*g*) latter to expreſs in *French*, what is plainly underſtood in the *Latin*, and expreſſed within four Lines before; and he cries out *Falſification and Corruption*, becauſe the *Proteſtant* Publiſher of *Bertram* doth with an Aſterisk refer the Reader to the Margin, and there explains a word in the Text by another *Latin* word, which he thought equivalent.

A Man might therefore reaſonably expect, that Mr. *Boileau* had avoided all theſe Faults, and that if his Verſion had any defect, it ſhould be in the grace of his Language only, by his keeping too cloſe to the Authors own Terms. But I perceive Mr. *Boileau* is ſubject to that general Weakneſs of Humane Nature which makes men very ſevere againſt thoſe Vices in others, which they diſcern not in themſelves. For certainly ne-

(*f*) Preface, p. 47, 48.
(*g*) Remarques, p. 250. and p. 277.

ver

ver did any Man uſe thoſe undue liberties of adding, omitting, and altering the Authors words at a more Extravagant rate, than he hath done in Tranſlating *Bertram*: Inſomuch that ſhould he riſe from the Dead, he would find his Senſe and Doctrine as much changed, as the French Tongue is ſince his days. For Mr. *Boileau* doth not content himſelf to refer the Reader to the Margin, or to his Remarks for the Expoſition of a controverted Term, which he might have done without impeaching his own Sincerity, but he mixeth his gloſs by way of Paraphraſe with the Text, and doth not by any difference of Character, or by encloſing them in Hooks [ ] diſtinguiſh his own words from the Authors, ſo that the Reader who underſtands not *Latin*, cannot tell when he reads *Bertram*, and when Mr. *Boileau*.

I ſhall not tire my ſelf, or the Reader with a compleat Liſt of his unfair Dealings, but give him ſome remarkable inſtances by which he may take an eſtimate of Mr. *Boileau*'s exactneſs and fidelity.

I ſhall begin with his Fraudulent Omiſſions, which are but few; and of

of theſe I ſhall give you two Inſtances, both near the beginning of the Book.

Mr. *Boileau.*	Ratram.
For it is not the *Appearance* of Fleſh, that is ſeen in that Bread, or of Blood in the Wine.	N. 10. (*h*) *Non enim ſecundum quod videtur, vel carnis* Species *in illo Pane cognoſcitur, vel in illo vino cruoris* unda *monſtratur.*

Having rendred *Species Carnis*, the appearance of Fleſh, he gently ſlides over the word *unda*, and leaves it Untranſlated; by which means he tacitly inſinuates to the unwary Reader, that *Ratram* doth not deny the Subſtance of Fleſh and Blood to be in the Sacrament: But only ſaith that the *Appearance* of Fleſh, and Blood is not diſcerned therein. Whereas the word *unda*, Liquor, imports the *Liquid Subſtance* of Blood, and therefore by parity of Reaſon, *Species* muſt ſignifie ſomewhat more than the meer viſible accidents of Fleſh:

(*h*) Car ce n'eſt pas l'apparence de la chair, que l'on voit dans ce pain— ny du ſang dans le vin.

So that if he deny the Subſtance of Blood to be in the Wine, he could not believe the Subſtance of Fleſh to be in the Bread.

If it be alledged, that *Ratram* only ſaith, that they are not *known* or *diſcerned*, or *ſhewn* therein, he doth not ſay they *are not there* inviſibly. The anſwer is obvious. *Ratram* eſteemed our Senſes competent Judges of what we orally receive in the Sacrament, and able to diſtinguiſh Fleſh from Bread. And withal, as I ſhall ſhortly prove, the words *cognoſcitur*, and *monſtratur*, and *oſtenditur*, are frequently uſed as the *Copula* of a Propoſition, and ſignifie no more than *Eſt*, and have nothing of Emphaſis in them.

Another crafty omiſſion is of the word *Sacrament*, which he leaves out in Tranſlating the laſt words of Number XII.

Ratram.	M. *Boileau.*
Hic vero Panis & Vinum prius fuere, (i) quam tranſitum in Sacramentum Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti fecerunt.	But here the Bread and Wine did exiſt before they paſſed into, or were changed into the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

(i) Avant qu'ils paſſaſſent au Corps & au ſang de *J. C.*

How

How wide difference there is between being turned into Chriſts Body and Blood, and into the SACRAMENT of his Body and Blood; any one knows, who is not blind becauſe he will not ſee. I wonder why Mr. *Boileau* did not omit the ſame word in other like Paſſages; as where our Author ſaith, "That Wine is made "*the Sacrament* of Chriſts Blood by "the Prieſts Conſecration thereof: And again, "That the Elements are "Spiritually made *Myſteries or Sa-* "*craments* of Chriſts Body and Blood, *&c.* For theſe Expreſſions teach us how to underſtand him in other places, where he ſaith, *That Bread and Wine are made the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, viz. that they are made the *Memorials*, *Symbols*, or *Sacraments* thereof. For we have no reaſon to doubt, that *Ratram* who from St. *Auguſtine* obſerveth, that it is familiar to give the name of the thing ſignified to the Sign or Sacrament, by reaſon of its Analogy thereunto, I ſay we have no reaſon to doubt, but that he frequently doth ſo himſelf in this Book.

I ſhall next give you a taſte of his bold Paraphraſes and Additions to the

the Author's Text, ſo that it is very difficult for a Common Reader to diſtinguiſh *Ratram*'s own words from Mr. *Boileau*'s Expoſition of them. And paſſing by many of his leſs Material, though large Interpolations, I ſhall inſtance in ſome foiſted in to ſerve the Cauſe of Tranſubſtantiation againſt the Author's true Senſe. What is not in the *Latin*, I have encloſed thus in [ ] Hooks for the Readers eaſe.

Ratram, N. XI.	Mr. *Boileau*.
(k) *Sed totum in* Veritate *conſpiciatur.*	But the whole that is ſeen there, is [the Pure] verity. So N. XXXII.

And in ſeveral other places, he renders *Veritas* the [Pure] Verity. If he believe that really to be the Author's meaning, he might have adverтiſed his Reader in a Marginal Note; but the inſerting that Explication into the Text is more than well conſiſts, with that great exactneſs in Tranſlating, to which he pretends.

(k) Et que tout ce que l'on y voit, ſoit la Pure Verité.

It

It were eaſie to gueſs, though he had not acquainted us in a Remark, for what end he foiſted in the word *Pure*; it was to inſinuate that *Ratram* diſputes not againſt *Paſchaſe*, but againſt ſome unknown Adverſaries, who held there was no Vail or Figure in the Sacrament, and that Chriſt's Body preſented it ſelf Naked to our View. Now that theſe Extravagant Opinioniſts never had any being, ſave in Mr. *Boileau*'s Imagination, hath been already ſhewn. And as he is pleaſed to make them expreſs their Sentiments, *viz. That the whole which is ſeen is the pure Verity*; it were more reaſonable to think, that they believed nothing but a Figure in the Sacrament, nothing but Bread and Wine, ſince nothing elſe is diſcerned by the Eye. And he makes them elſewhere to ſay, (*l*) *That the whole is juſt what it appears to the Eye.* If the Notion were that the Accidents of Bread and Wine, whoſe firſt Subject was deſtroyed, were tranſlated into Chriſt's Natural Body, it was

(*l*) Mais que tout y eſt tel qu'il paroiſt aux yeux, n. 54.

very improper for him to make them ſay that the Senſible Object was the *Pure* Verity; for it muſt needs be a Prodigious Compound of one Subſtance diveſted of its natural Qualities; and the proper Accidents of another Subſtance.

Again, This Tranſlator in many places doth greatly corrupt the Author's Senſe by inſerting the Particle [there], which though it be the addition of a ſingle Letter [y] in the *French*, yet it makes almoſt as great a change in *Ratram*'s Doctrine, as the *Arrians* made in the Chriſtian Faith, by the addition of an *Iota* to the word *Homoouſios*. For hereby he inſinuates *the Preſence* of Chriſt's Natural Body, in an inviſible manner, where the Author had no intention to ſay any thing of Chriſt's Preſence at all, but only to ſhew that the Conſecrated Elements are Chriſt's Body and Blood, which in *Ratram*'s ſenſe we alſo acknowledge them to be. I ſhall give an Inſtance or two of his Fraud in this kind.

For

For [we there ſee] nothing, which paſſed from not being into being.

N. XII. (*m*) *Nam nec ex eo quod non erat, tranſivit in aliquid quod ſit.*

His deſign is by that addition to inſinuate, that although we ſee it not, ſome other Subſtance *is there preſent*, under the Vails or Accidents of Bread and Wine. Whereas *Ratram* only ſaith, that the Conſecrated Elements did not paſs from a ſtate of *Non-entity* into Being.

Now if none of theſe three changes be here made, we muſt conclude, that nothing is [there] but what was before. But [there] is ſome other thing, for the Bread is made the Body, and the Wine the Blood of Chriſt.

Again, N. XIII. (*n*) *Si ergo nihil eſt hic permutatum, non eſt aliud quam ante fuit. Eſt autem aliud, quoniam Panis Corpus & Vinum Sanguis Chriſti facta ſunt.*

(*m*) Car on n' y voit rien qui, &c.

(*n*) Or s'il n' y a aucun de ces trois changemens, il en faut conclure qu'il n' y a rien qui n' ait eté auparavant. Cependant il y a autre choſe.

Here he insinuates the Presence of some other thing in the place, and under the Accidents of Bread and Wine, whereas all that *Ratram* saith is this, That if there be no change upon Consecration, not as our Translator makes him speak, none of those three Changes, which were to make him argue against himself, who had newly in expres terms denied any of those three Changes. I say, if there be no change at all made, then the Elements after Consecration are nothing more than they before were: But they are something more, for the Bread and Wine are made Christ's Body and Blood, that is, as our Author often expounds himself, *Mystically*, *Spiritually*, *Figuratively*. And this may very well be, without the Invisible Presence of Christs Natural Flesh in the place of the Bread.

Again, N. XVI. (o) *Quoniam sub Velamento Corporei Panis Corporeque Vini, Spirituale Cor-*

For under the Vail of Corporeal Bread, and Corporeal Wine, the Spiritual Body of Christ, and his Spiri-

(o) S'y rencontrent & y existent.

tual

tual Blood [is there found and there] exists.

pus Christi, Spiritualisque Sanguis existit.

The Presence of Christs Natural Body and Blood under the Accidents of Bread and Wine, is intimated in the Addition of the Particle *there*, in this Sentence. Whereas *Bertram* saith nothing like it, but only proves that the change wrought by Consecration is not a Physical, but a Figurative, or Mystical change, because Christ's Spiritual, that is, as hath been shewn, his Symbolical, or Sacramental Body and Blood are in, or under the Vail of Material Bread and Wine.

I should not so much have regarded this little Interpolation, but Mr. *Boileau* swaggers so much with these Passages both in his (*p*) Preface and Remarks, and draweth Inferences from them, whereas he therein imposeth on the Reader, who consults not the Author's *Latin*, which without his Interpolation, gives no colour for such Inferences.

In the same Paragraph, immediately before the words last cited, we have another Instance of his exactness in Translating.

(*p*) P. 26. & 226.

And this change is not made Corporally [that is to ſay, in that which falls under the Bodily Senſes] but Spiritually.

(q) *Neque iſta commutatio Corporaliter, ſed Spiritualiter facta ſit.*

Whether he hath given the true meaning of the Term ſhall be elſewhere conſidered, but in the mean time it was fit that Mr. *Dean* ſhould be told, that he deals not fairly to foiſt his own gloſs into the Author's Text.

Here ariſeth a Queſtion,— touching which many hold, That in all theſe things there is not any Figure, but the whole is done in [Pure] Verity, [that is to ſay, in a manner that is Senſible and Corporal, by which the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt is cut into bits like our ordinary Meat.]

(r) Again, n. XXXII. *Hic jam illa ſuboritur Quæſtio quam plurimi proponentes loquuntur, non in Figura* (r) *ſed* in Veritate *iſta fieri.*

(q) Corporellement, c'eſt a dire, en ce qui tombe ſous les ſens corporels, mais ſpirituellement.

(r) Mais que tout s'y fait dans la pure verite: c'eſt a dire, d'une maniere ſenſible & corporelle, par la quelle la chair de JESUS CHRIST eſt diviſee par morceaux comme une viande ordinaire.

Moſt

Moſt exactly Tranſlated! But ſure *Veritas* is one of the moſt pregnant words in the *Latin* Tongue, which carries all this in its Belly. Now the uſe of this Gloſs appears more plainly N. XXXIV. where Mr. *Dean* makes this to be the Notion of *Carnally* eating Chriſt's Fleſh.

Bertram having cited (*ſ*) St. *Auguſtine* to confirm his own Expoſition of our Saviour's Words, *John* 6. 54. *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye ſhall have no Life in you.* Which is, that they muſt be underſtood *Figuratively*, and not *Literally*. He adds, that in this Fathers Judgment, to eat Chriſt's Body *Carnally*, is ſo far from being an Act of Religion, that it would be a piece of horrid Wickedneſs. But what is this barbarous crime of eating *Carnally?* Why Mr. *Boileau* here explains the Point. It conſiſts (*t*) *in cutting Chriſt's Body into bits, and in bruiſing it between the Teeth, like our*

(*ſ*) Facinus vel Flagitium videtur habere. Figura ergo eſt præcipiens, &c. *n.* 33.

(*t*) Recevoir charnellement, c'eſt a dire, en le broiant avec les dents & le coupant par morceaux.

ordinary Meat. What pity is it, that Mr. *Boileau* had not been in our Saviour's Train, to have anſwered thoſe Diſciples which were offended at this Doctrine, and complained of it as an (*u*) hard ſaying. I warrant you, it would have given marvellous ſatisfaction, had any one told them: "Sirs, you groſsly miſtake the matter, you imagine that Chriſt's "Fleſh is to be eaten like common "Meat out of the Shambles, that it "muſt be cut in bits on your Trencher, and chewed ſmall before it "will go down. It is no ſuch, it is "not a dead but living Body that he "gives you to eat, nor are you to touch "it with your Knife, or Teeth, but "ſwallow him whole. And becauſe "it might otherwiſe go againſt your "Stomach, you are not to receive "his Body under the Offenſive Species or Appearances of Fleſh, but, "in the ſame manner as Phyſicians "ſometimes give a *Nauſeous Bolus*, "wrapt up in a Wafer, ſo that you "ſhall neither ſee nor taſte it.

This would have been very Edifying no doubt, it would have removed the

(*u*) John 6. 60.

Scan-

Scandal, and have reduced thoſe Apoſtates to our Saviour. But can any man in his Wits believe, that their Scruple was meerly about the cutting and mangling of our Saviour's Body, and that they would have made no bones of ſwallowing him whole? No ſure, they ſtumbled at the Literal Senſe of his Words, they could not digeſt a command to eat mans Fleſh, which ſeemed (as St. *Auſtine* obſerves) to be an impious Precept; and they would no doubt have as much abhorred him, (could ſuch a Monſter have been found) who ſhould ſwallow a man whole, as an ordinary Canibal.

But is Mr. *Boileau* in earneſt, when he tells us (*w*), that to cut Chriſt's Body in pieces, and tear it with the Teeth, is the true Notion of *Carnal eating*. Doth our Saviour's anſwer to thoſe murmuring Deſerters any wiſe countenance this Notion? Doth it give the leaſt hint that their miſtake and ſcandal lay, in apprehending that

(*w*) J'ay ajoute [c'eſt a dire, en la broiant avec les dents & le coupant par morceaux] parce que c'eſt le veritable ſens de ces mots Charnellement, &c. Remarques, p. 236.

Chriſt's

Chriſt's Body was to be eaten piecemeal? No; but he blames their ſtupidity, for taking his Words, which are SPIRIT, and LIFE, in a carnal or litteral Senſe.

St. *Auſtine* cited by *Bertram*, expounding our Saviour's Anſwer, makes it import, that his words touching the neceſſity of eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood, muſt be *Spiritually*, that is, *Myſtically*, and not *carnally* or *literally* underſtood. In another place cited by (x) *Bertram*, he makes the hard ſaying an Inſtance of the neceſſity of underſtanding the words of Scripture in a Figurative Senſe, telling us thoſe words "are "a FIGURE, enjoyning us to com-"municate in our Saviour's Suffer-"ings, by a faithful and profitable "commemoration of his Death on "the Croſs for us.

I confeſs both St. *Auſtine* and *Bertram*, deſcribing the miſtake of theſe Diſciples, deny that his Body was to be cut into pieces, and eaten by bits, but they make not this to have been the ſcruple of thoſe Infidels, nor do either of thoſe Writers ſo much as

(x) N. 33, 34.

hint,

hint, that Chriſt's Body was to be ſwallowed whole. On the contrary, St. *Auſtine* makes it to have been their Erroneous conceit, that (y) *Chriſt intended to give them his Natural Body, his Body which they ſaw with their Eyes.* And *Bertram* ſhewing how our Saviour's Words confute that groſs Conceit, ſaith by way of Paraphraſe on them, that when his Diſciples ſhould behold him aſcend into Heaven, with his Body and Blood entire and without Diminution, they ſhould then underſtand the miſtake of thoſe carnal Infidels, *viz.* That he did not command them to eat his Natural Body, which was impoſſible, ſince it was conveyed from them unto Heaven. This Paraphraſe he borrowed from (z) St. *Auſtine*,

(y) Illi putabant ſe erogaturum Corpus ſuum; ille autem dixit ſe aſcenſurum in cœlum utique integrum. *Apud Ratram, n.* 80.

(z) Verba quæ locutus ſum, *Spiritus & Vita ſunt*, ſpiritualiter intelligite quod locutus ſum. *Non hoc Corpus quod videtis manducaturi eſtis*, &c. Aug. in Pſ. 98. & in Joannem Tract. 27. Intellexerunt —— quia —— diſponebat Jeſus, carnem *qua indutum erat verbum* veluti conciſam diſtribuere credentibus, &c.

whom

whom he cites for it, *N.* 80. And (*a*) *Ælfric* as hath been ſhewn, expounds the words as did (*b*) St. *Auſt.*

Again, N.XL. (*c*) *Sicut hujus Viſibilis Panis, Vinique ſubſtantia exteriorem nutrit & inebriat hominem*, &c.

As the Viſible Subſtance [that is to ſay, what appears to our Eyes] of this Bread, and this Wine, nouriſheth and quencheth the thirſt of the outward man, *&c.*

In rendring this half Sentence, there is a double Fraud committed. 1. The Adjective *Viſible*, is unduly applied to the word *Subſtance*, whereby he hoped to perſuade the Reader, that Subſtance is not here to be underſtood in its proper Senſe, but only for the Senſible Qualities of Bread and Wine, whereas this Author joyned that Adjective to the Bread and Wine. *Iſidore* ſaith, (*d*) *The ſubſtance of this Viſible Bread and*

(*a*) Sax. Hom. *Fol.* 44.

(*b*) Aug. in Pſ. 98.

(*c*) Parce que comme la Subſtance viſible c'eſt a dire ce qui paroiſt aux yeux de ce pain & de ce vin.

(*d*) Hujus viſibilis Panis, Vinique Subſtantia.

Wine;

Wine; not as Mr. *Boileau* Tranſlates him, the *Viſible Subſtance*, i. e. Qualities *of this Bread and Wine feed the outward Man.* 2. The Notion of the word *Viſible* is corrupted by the Tranſlator's Gloſs inſerted into the Text of *Iſidore*, viz. *That which appears to the Eye of this Bread*, &c. *viz.* the Accidents; whereas the Author meant *material* Bread and Wine. The Paſſage is a clear Authority againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and deſerves a Remark or two.

1. The Bread and Wine whereof he ſpeaks is *Conſecrated* Bread and Wine, which the Pronoun THIS demonſtrates. 2. He ſaith that the SUBSTANCE of this Bread and Wine [after Conſecration] do nouriſh the Body. 3. He calls it *Viſible* Bread and Wine, which Term is ſo far from importing what our Adverſaries would have it, *viz.* *The Senſible Qualities* only, that it ſignifies *Material* Bread and Wine, as I hope to prove beyond all Diſpute, when I come to Examine Mr. *Boileau*'s Expoſition of the Controverted Terms. So that I do not wonder that theſe words are not now read in *Iſidore*'s Works.

In

In the like manner he corrupts *Bertram, N. LII.*

(e) *Hoc enim quod ſumit Corpus Corruptibile eſt.*

For this [Viſible and Senſible] Body which is received, is ſubject to Corruption.

The Epithetes *Viſible and Senſible*, are impertinently as well as deceitfully foiſted in, for if he had minded the Authors words; *Corpus* in that place imports not the Body of Chriſt received, but the Body of the Receiver, and the Clauſe ſhould have been thus rendred, *That which the Body receives is Corruptible.* I ſhould not have taken notice of this Slip, as I have not of ſome other meer ſlips in Tranſlation, had it not been for the Fraud thereby deſigned.

A worſe piece of falſe dealing appears in the next Paragraph, N. LIII. where he adds a falſe Gloſs to the words of St. *Ambroſe*.

(e) Car ce Corps Viſible & Senſible que l'on recoit.

Doth

Doth it not require a greater power to Create a thing of nothing, than to change the Natures, [that is, the Subſtances of things.]

Nonne majus eſt novas res dare quam mutare (f) naturas ?

He tells us (g) "That the *Natures* "here mentioned can be no other "than thoſe of Bread and Wine, "changed into Chriſts Body and "Blood ; and this obliged him to "add the word *Subſtances* by way of "Explication. Now admitting what he ſaith, I can ſee no ſuch neceſſity of underſtanding the word of the *Natural Subſtances* of the Elements. Neither this Context of St. *Ambroſe*, to which he refers, nor *Bertram*'s Expoſition of that Father, nor yet the force of the word *Nature* it ſelf, do any way oblige him to it.

For, 1. St. *Ambroſe* parallels the change made by Conſecration in the Holy Euchariſt with ſeveral others, which are not Subſtantial changes,

(f) Pour changer les Natures; c'eſt a dire les Subſtances des choſes?

(g) Remarks, p. 245.

as

as the dividing the Waters of the (*h*)Red Sea and *Jordan*. The ſweetning of the Waters of *Marah*, the cauſing of Iron to ſwim, which are only changes of the Natural Qualities, not of the Subſtances of things.

2. Neither doth *Bertram* expounding St. *Ambroſe* any way Authorize that Gloſs, but on the contrary directs us to take the word *Nature* in another Senſe, by an expreſs denial of any change in the Subſtance of Bread and Wine. *As to* (*i*) *the Subſtance of the Creatures, they continue after Conſecration, what they were before*, viz. *Bread and Wine.*

3. Neither will *he* ſay that the word *Natures* can bear no other Senſe, *who* contends, that the word *Subſtance* may ſignifie no more than the Senſible Qualities of a thing. And it were groſs Trifling for me to labour in the proof of the contrary

---

(*h*) Nonne claret *Naturam* vel maritimorum fluctuum, vel fluvialis curſus eſſe mutatam? *Ambroſ. Ibid.*

(*i*) Nam ſecundum Creaturarum Subſtantiam, quod fuerunt ante Conſecrationem, hoc & poſtea conſiſtunt: Panis & Vinum prius extitere, &c. *N. LIV.*

by

by Examples. Nevertheleſs I ſhall give him one, out of *Salvian*, ſpeaking of ſome of thoſe changes which St. *Ambroſe* parallels with that in the Sacrament. Having proved Gods Providence, by miraculous methods, in which he brought the *Iſraelites* out of *Egypt*, protected and fed them in the Wilderneſs, he goes on thus: (*k*) "To this add new Fountains inſtant-"ly ſpringing out of the Earth, alſo "Medicated Waters, the one gi-"ven [Miraculouſly], the others "changed [and made wholeſome] "keeping their *Species* [or Na-"tural Subſtance] and forſaking "their *Nature*, *i. e.* Natural Quali-"ties, *viz.* Bitterneſs, and Un-"wholeſomeneſs. Here *Species* ſig-nifies the *Subſtance*, and *Natura* the *Senſible Quality* of Bitterneſs.

Another corrupting Interpolation may be obſerved in the words which immediately follow, *N. LIV.*

(*k*) Adde huc fontes repentè natos, adde medicatas aquas, vel datas, vel immutatas, SPECIEM ſervantes, NATURAM relinquentes, *Salv. de Gub. l.* 1. *p.* 21. *Edit. Baluz. Par.* 1669.

(*l*) *Dicit Sanctus* Ambroſius *in illo Myſterio Sanguinis & Corporis Chriſti commutationem eſſe factam, & mirabiliter*, &c.

St. *Ambroſe* ſaith, That in this Myſtery of Chriſt's Body and Blood the change [of one thing into another] is admirable.

Not to inſiſt on his licentious alteration of the *Syntax*, I appeal to any Man that underſtands *Latin*, whether *Ratram* make St. *Ambroſe* to ſay (*l*) that in the Sacrament one thing is changed into another, that is, as Mr. *Boileau* would have it, (*m*) *one Subſtance into another*. *Ratram* infers no more than this, That there is a change made, which no Body denies: But that this change is *of one thing or ſubſtance into another* is Mr. *Boileau*'s Fiction, who baſely impoſeth on his Reader, both in his Preface and Remarks, citing this place ſo Tranſlated, to prove that this Author's Sentiments could not poſſibly be different from thoſe of the Church of

(*l*) St. *Ambroiſe* dit, que — le changement qui ſe fait d'une choſe en une autre eſt admirable, &c.

(*m*) Remarques, p. 246.

Rome.

Rome. Whereas in the words immediately following, as I obſerved juſt before, he denieth expreſly any ſubſtantial change.

I might add many more Inſtances of his foul Gloſſes inſerted into the Text, ſuch as Tranſlating *Veritas*, the [Viſible and Senſible] Truth, or [with all its Dimenſions]. *Proprium Corpus Chriſti*, the Proper Body of Chriſt, [together with its Natural Properties], *&c.* But I am weary of tracing him in theſe By-ways, and ſhould I follow him further, my trouble would be endleſs, almoſt every Paragraph to the end of the Book, being thus corrupted.

I ſhall therefore give but an Example or two, of his bold Variations from the Author's Words, as well as Senſe.

N. XIV. *Quærendum ergo eſt ab eis qui nihil hic Figurate volunt accipere, ſed totum in veritatis ſimpli-*

It muſt be demanded of thoſe who pretend that there is no Figure, and who maintain that all is there ſpoken in

citate conſiſtere (*n*), *ſecundum quod demutatio facta ſit*, ut jam non ſint quod ante fuerunt, videlicet, Panis atque Vinum; *ſed ſint Corpus atque Sanguis Chriſti.*

the pure and ſimple Verity, how this Change is made, ſo that the things which *were* before, *are no longer*, that is, *the Bread and Wine which were* or did exiſt *before*, *are* or do exiſt *no longer*, but are become the Body and Blood of J. Chriſt.

All that the Author intended to ſay, was no more than this, That after Conſecration, the Elements are not what they were before it, but ſomewhat more excellent, than common Bread and Wine, *viz.* The Body and Blood of Chriſt. He never intended to deny the Exiſtence of the Elements, as this Verſion makes him to do. The words are plain and intelligible, but Mr. *Boileau*, by ſome unknown Rules of Conſtruction inverts their natural Or-

(*n*) Il faut donc demander — comment ce Changement ſoit fait; de ſorte que les choſes qui etoient auparavant, *ne ſoient plus*, c'eſt a dire, que le pain & le vin qui etoient auparavant *ne ſoient plus*, mais, &c.

der,

der, and joyns a Nominative Singular to a Verb Plural, and then by a ſort of Logick as peculiar to himſelf, making the Predicate the Subject of his Propoſition, ſo renders the Paſſage as by a *(o)* Notorious Fallacy, to make the Author deny the Exiſtence of Bread and Wine, immediately after he had been proving it, and againſt the Scope of his Diſcourſe in this place.

For *Ratram* thus argues againſt his Adverſaries, "Either Conſecration "makes a *Figurative* Change of the "Elements, or elſe it makes *no change*. The abſurdity of ſaying the latter, is this, that then the Conſecrated Elements are not the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which to ſay is Impious.

And to make good his Conſequence, he reminds them of what he had largely proved juſt before, that the Elements as to their *Species*, or *Nature*, had undergone no change,

(*o*) A dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter, vel, ab *eſt* tertii adjecti ad *eſt* ſecundi adjecti in propoſitione Negativa, quales conſequentiæ non neceſſario valent, & non raro falſiſſimæ ſunt.

there being no Substance produced a-new, none corrupted, nor yet so much as altered in its Natural Qualities by Consecration, and therefore no Physical Change made thereby. But Mr. *Boileau* is resolved in defiance both of *Priscian* and *Aristotle*, to make poor *Ratram* say what he pleaseth.

I hope it may be denied of the Water in Baptism, or the Chrism, or a Church after Consecration, that *they are what they were before*; that is, common Water, or Oil, or an Ordinary House, without denying Water, Oyl, or the Building *to exist any longer*. And in this sense, (*p*) St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, saith, *As the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are not meer, or common Bread and Wine; so after the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, the Chrism is not common Oyl.* And in like manner, *Catech.* 1. He compares the Sacramental Bread and Wine, with Meats offered to Idols, teaching, "That as the former by the Invoca-

(*p*) Cyril. Catech. Mystag. 3. Ὥσπερ, καὶ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· οὕτω τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι τις κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, &c.

"tion

" tion of the Holy Trinity, of com-
" mon Bread and Wine are made the
" Body and Blood of Chriſt, ſo the
" Meats offered to Idols are in their
" nature common Meat, *i. e.* Law-
" ful, but by Invocation of Devils
" they are rendred profane, or un-
" lawful. Which infers no deſtruction of the Old Subſtance, but only the introducing of a new Quality, or relation to the impure Dæmons, which rendred the Meat prophane or unclean.

So that to be made what a thing was not before, infers not neceſſarily *that it* ceaſeth *to be what it was before*; it is ſufficient that it receiveth ſome new perfection, or additional Dignity.

Again, N. LVI. *Intellige quod* (q) *non in Specie, ſed in Virtute, Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti exiſtant, quæ cernuntur.*

Know aſſuredly that the things which fall under the Senſes, are not Chriſts Body and Blood, in their *Species*, or Viſible Appearance, but that they, [viz. *Chriſts Body and Blood*] *are there by the Vertue of the Word.*

(q) Les choſes qui y tombent ſous le ſens, ne ſont pas le Corps & le ſang de J. C. dans leur eſpece ou apparence viſible, mais *qu'ils y ſont* par la Vertu *du Verbe.*

Ratram ſaith, That the Viſible Elements, are Chriſt's Body and Blood, *not in Nature, but in Virtue*, which is a diſtinction underſtood by every Freſhman; but Mr. *Boileau* makes him to ſay, That which deſtroyeth the Antitheſis, which inſinuates an unheard of diſtinction of *Appearance*, and *Virtue*, and which is not a proper Anſwer to the Objection ſtarted upon the Authority of St. *Ambroſe*. Mark you (ſay *Ratram*'s Adverſaries) This Father, teacheth (*r*), that what is ſeen on the Lords Table, and orally received, is the Body and Blood of Chriſt. To this *Ratram* anſwers by a diſtinction, and ſheweth in what ſenſe the Holy Elements are Chriſt's Body and Blood, and in what ſenſe they are not ſo, *viz.* In their *Species* or *Nature* they are not Chriſt's Body and Blood, but in their *Virtue* and *Efficacy*. It was not his buſineſs to affirm the preſence of Chriſts Body and Blood, but to give an account in what ſenſe St. *Ambroſe*

(*r*) Hic jam ſurgit Auditor & dicit, Corpus Chriſti eſſe quod cernitur, & Sanguinem qui bibitur, *&c.*

affirmed

affirmed the Conſecrated Elements to be Chriſts Body and Blood.

Again, N. LXXVII. (s) *Si enim Corpus Chriſti eſt & hoc dicitur vere, quia Corpus Chriſti eſt, in Veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt: & ſi in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt, &c.*

If this Body which is celebrated in the Church be Chriſt's, and it be ſo *called* truly, becauſe it is the Body of Chriſt, then it is the Body of Chriſt *in Truth*, that is, as it ſheweth it ſelf to the Eye, & if ſo *&c.*

It was cunningly done to make Non-ſenſe of an Argument, which truly tranſlated, would have quite ſpoiled the whole deſign of *M. Boileau*'s Verſion and Remarks. He could not be ignorant that *dicitur vere quia, &c.* ought to have been rendred *if it be truly* [*i. e.* properly] *affirmed that it is Chriſt's Body.* And that he argueth, that it is not *in propriety of Speech affirmed* to be Chriſt's Body, becauſe it is not ſo *in Truth of Nature*, in regard Chriſt's

(s) *Car ſi ce Corps eſt celuy de J.C. & s' il eſt ainſi* appellé *veritablement parce qu'il eſt le Corps du J. C. il eſt le Corps de J. C. dans la Verité, c'eſt a dire de la maniere dont il ſe comporte, & dont il paroiſt a nos yeux, &c.*

Natural

Natural Body is Incorruptible, Impaſſible and Eternal, whereas the Sacrament is undeniably corrupted, being broken in pieces, chewed ſmall by the Teeth, digeſted, and turned into the Subſtance of the Receivers Body.

But to trouble my ſelf and the Reader with no more particulars of his falſe dealings, I ſhall give you an entire Paragraph exactly tranſlated from his French, which I deſire may be compared with the Authors Latin.

N. LVII. *Quam diligenter quam prudenter facta diſtinctio! De carne Chriſti quæ crucifixa eſt, quæ ſepulta eſt, id eſt, ſecundum (t) quam Chriſtus & crucifixus eſt & ſepultus, ait "Vera "itaque Caro Chriſti, & de illa quæ ſumitur in Sacramento "Vere ergo carnis illius*

Now obſerve with what prudence St. *Ambroſe* eſtabliſheth this diſtinction! He ſaith of the Fleſh which was crucified and buried, that is, according to which Chriſt was crucified and buried, (t) [that is to ſay in the ſenſible appearance whereof JeſusChriſt was crucified and buried.] It is the True Fleſh of

(t) *C'eſt a dire dans l'apparence ſenſible de la quelle J. C. a eté crucifié, & enſeveli.*

Jeſus

Sacramentum eſt ; *Diſtinguens* Sacramentum Carnis *a* Veritate Carnis : *Quatenus* in Veritate Carnis *quam ſumpſerat de Virgine, diceret eum & crucifixum & ſepultum, quod vero nunc agitur in Eccleſia Myſterium veræ illius carnis in qua crucifixus eſt, diceret eſſe* Sacramentum : *Patenter Fideles inſtituens, quod illa Caro ſecundum quam & crucifixus eſt Chriſtus & Sepultus, non ſit* Myſterium *ſed* Veritas Naturæ ; *hæc vero Caro quæ nunc ſimilitudinem illius in Myſterio continet, non ſit* Specie *Caro, ſed* Jeſus Chriſt. But of that receivd in the *Sacrament*, he ſaith, it is truly the Sacrament of that Fleſh, diſtinguiſhing of his Fleſh from the [Senſible] Verity of his Fleſh; meaning, that according to the [Senſible] Verity of his Fleſh, Chriſt was crucified and buried, and that the Myſtery celebrated in the Church, is the Sacrament of that True [and Senſible] Fleſh in which he was crucified. And thereby plainly teaching the Faithful, that this [Senſible] in and according to which Chriſt was Crucified and Buried, is no Myſtery, but the (*u*) Verity of Nature [with all its dimenſions] whereas that Fleſh

(*u*) *Mais la verite de la nature, avec toutes ſes dimenſions au lieu que cette chair, qui en contient l' Image dans le Myſtere n' eſt pas la chair ſelon l' apparence, & ſelon ce qui tombe ſous le ſens, mais dans le Sacrament. Puis que ſelon les apparences ſenſibles ce que l'on voit eſt du Pain, &c.*

which

Sacramento. *Siquidem* in Specie *Panis eſt*, *in* Sacramento *verum Chriſti Corpus*, *ſicut ipſe clamat Dominus Jeſus*, Hoc eſt Corpus meum.

which contains the Image hereof in the Myſtery, is not Fleſh, according *to Senſible Appearance*, but *in the Sacrament*. For according to the *Senſible Appearance*, *that which we behold* is Bread, and that in the Sacrament it is the True Body of Chriſt, as he himſelf declareth in theſe words, *This is my Body*.

This is a remarkable Specimen of Fidelity in Tranſlating, and may ſuffice to let the Reader ſee, how far he is to rely on the Tranſlators exactneſs and ſincerity, or to give credit to the Teſtimony of his Brethren of the *Sorbon*, who have under their hands declared, this Verſion of *M. Boileau* and his Notes to be conformable in every thing to the Text of this Ancient Author.

I ſhall now in the laſt place endeavour to ſhew, that the Senſe, which he impoſeth on the Technical Terms by which we are to learn the Author's true Sentiments, is generally forced, and often abſurd; that it is not agreeable to the ſcope of the Author, neither

neither are thoſe Terms ſo uſed by Eccleſiaſtical Writers of the ſame or elder Times.

I ſhall begin with the word *Veritas*, which is one of the Terms of the firſt Queſtion, and often occurs in this Tract. Now when *Ratram* denieth that which is *orally received* in the Sacrament, to be Chriſt's Body and Blood in *Verity*, or his *True* Body and Blood, we underſtand him to deny the Holy Euchariſt to be his Body and Blood in *Reality* or *Truth of Nature*, or which is all one, his Natural Body. And in caſe *we* (*w*) be in the right, *M. Boileau* confeſſeth that *he* muſt yield the Point in diſpute, and abandon poor *Ratram* as the Author of *Calvin*'s Hereſie; ſo he is pleaſed to ſtyle the Doctrine of the Ancient Church for the nine or ten firſt Centuries.

He therefore tells us, that of (*x*) Two and forty places in which

---

(*w*) *Si cette pretention avoit ete autoriſée de quelque bonne preuve------ il n'y auroit pas lieu de doubter, qui n' euſt ete l' Inventeur de l' Hereſie du Calvin.* p. 27. Pref.

(*x*) Pref. p. 31.

thoſe

thoſe Terms *Verum* and *Veritas* are found in this Book, there are not above ſeven or eight (of which the *Proteſtants* can make no advantage) in which they ſignifie *Real* or *Reality*, and in the other Three and thirty, ſo curious hath Mr. *Dean* been in his Obſervations, it imports only the *Manifeſtation*, or *Senſible Appearance* of Chriſt's Body. That in this ſenſe *Ratram* oppoſeth *Verity* to a *Figure*, and denieth the Holy Euchariſt to be Chriſt's *true* Body and Blood, from which nothing can be concluded againſt the Real Preſence, which is, as he explains it, *the Proper Subſtance and Humane Nature of Jeſus Chriſt.*

Now on this Point we will joyn Iſſue, and I will firſt examine the Proofs he brings for his ſenſe of the word, and afterwards I ſhall ſhew that ſenſe to be falſe, abſurd, and contrary to the uſe of that Term in other Eccleſiaſtical Writers of the ſame and elder Times.

To make out his Notion of the Word, two things are offer'd by *M. Boileau.* 1. He ſaith, That *Ratram* himſelf expounds *Verity* by *Manifeſtation.* 2. That the Writers of the middle Ages uſe it to ſignifie the

Depo-

Depoſitions of Witneſſes, and the Proof of things.

To the former of theſe, ſomewhat hath already been ſaid in the (*y*) Diſſertation before this Tract, and in this Appendix, which I deſire the Reader to conſult, and I ſhall further add what I conceive will take off the force of this Argument.

I admit that *Ratram* doth ſo expound *Verity*, and defines it to be the *manifeſt Demonſtration* of a *thing*, but he no where expounds *Manifeſtation* to be the *Senſible Appearance*. I have already ſhewn that the *Verity* which he defines is *Propriety* and *Plainneſs of Speech* in oppoſition to *Figurative Speech*; and in that Notion of this word, divers things are *manifeſted* which have no Senſible Appearances. Theſe ſayings, that *the Father is God, the Soul is a Spirit*, that *Angels are Creatures*, are in *Ratram*'s ſenſe, the *naked Manifeſtation* of the *Truth*, or the *plain* or *manifeſt Demonſtration* of the things, which have no *Senſible Appearance* at all; that is, the words in their *native* ſignification import

(*y*) Pag. 66.

that

that which they are uſed to expreſs; whereas in the Figurative and Myſtical Forms of Speech, the words are uſed to expreſs quite another thing, than what they *really* and *naturally* import. So that the one is a covert and obſcure, the other a plain, proper and natural way of ſpeaking, and this *Bertram* calls *the clear light of Manifeſtation*, *the plain or ſimple Verity*; and our *Saxon* Homiliſt, as I have ſhewn, uſeth a word (z) of the ſame importance; whereas had he underſtood *Bertram* in that ſenſe *M. Boileau* doth, he muſt have expreſſed *Manifeſtation* by another word, which is afterwards uſed for the (a) *Senſible Demonſtration* of a thing.

Now as this Term, when applied to Forms of Speech, imports *Propriety* of *Speech*, ſo when applied to Things, it ſignifieth *Propriety* of *Nature*, or the *Very thing* it ſelf, without any Myſtical Signification of, or Reſpect unto *another thing*. And thus it ſtands oppoſed to a *Pledg*, an *Image*, or

---

(z) ȝeþiſſum ðinȝ *Fol* 29.

(a) ſume ſþuðelunȝe be ðam halȝan *h*uſel, *Fol.* 38.

Figure

Figure inſtituted to *repreſent* one thing, whilſt it is in *Subſtance*, in *Reality* and *Truth of Nature* another.

When its urged to prove that *Ratram* uſeth the word *Manifeſtation* to ſignifie the *Reality*, That he muſt uſe it in the ſame ſenſe it was uſed by his Adverſaries, who muſt either thereby underſtand, the *Reality*; or elſe believe the Holy Euchariſt to be our Saviour's Body, *in humane Form*, which none pretends they did: Mr. *Dean* briskly denies the Conſequence, and like a Doctor of great Authority, adds, (*b*) *I maintain that they only believed it to be Chriſt's Body affected with the Qualities of Bread.*

Now I appeal to any Man of common ſenſe, whether any thing can be more abſurd, than ſome Paſſages of this Book are, if ſo expounded? For Example, in that Prayer, (*c*) wherein the Church begs of God, to grant the *manifeſt Participation* of that,

---

(*b*) P. 35. *Je Soutiens, qu'ils ſe perſuadoient ſeulement de voir le Corps & le Sang de J. C. affectez des qualitez du pain & vin, &c.*

(*c*) N. 85. *Quod in imagine contingimus Sacramenti, manifeſta participatione ſumamus.*

which is received in a *Sacramental Image*, the meaning must be, that they might partake of our Saviour's Flesh, under the Sensible Appearance of Bread. And again, where (*d*) he saith, the Body which suffer'd and rose again, is our Saviour's Proper Body, and in it there is no Figure or Signification, but the *Manifestation* of the thing it self, he must mean, if *M. Boileau* hath hit upon the true Notion of *Ratram*'s Adversaries, that the Body of our Saviour which was crucified and rose again, is his Natural Body affected with the Sensible Accidents of Bread, which I take to be rank Nonsense, and so I am apt to think doth our Translator also: For he doth not render that Passage by the word *Manifestation*, as he had elsewhere done, leaving the Reader to seek the sense of so uncouth a Phrase in his Preface and Remarks, but he renders it by words importing our *Saviour's Body in Human Shape*. Though in so doing he makes *Bertram* a very despicable and

(*d*) N. 97. *Nec in eo vel aliqua figura vel significatio sed ipsa rei Manifestatio.*

imper-

impertinent Sophiſter, and to diſpute vehemently againſt an Opinion which his Adverſaries did not maintain. For ſo he doth, if they affirming the Holy Euchariſt to be Chriſt's Body affected with the Senſible Appearances of Bread, he brings Arguments to prove that it was not his Body *in its proper ſtate*, that is, retaining the *Members, Dimenſions, Lineaments, and all other Senſible Qualities* of a Man's Body.

That *Ratram* uſed *Manifeſtation* as a Term equivalent to the *Reality*, is clear to any Man who will obſerve how he uſeth the Adverb *Manifeſte*, which is one of its Conjugates. When he is deſcribing a Pledge and Image, he ſaith, (*e*) they have a relation to ſome other thing which they ſignifie, but *non manifeſte oſtendunt* do not manifeſtly ſhew, *i.e.* really exhibit. This muſt be his ſenſe, for he, he is delivering the Notion of Pledges and Images in General which are not the very thing for which they are depoſited, or which they repre-

(*e*) *Significant enim illa rem, cujus ſunt, non manifeſte oſtendunt.* N. 86.

ſent in *Subſtance* and *Reality*, and only want the Senſible Appearances thereof. For on the contrary, an *Image* hath the *Senſible Appearance* of what it repreſents without the *Reality*.

I do not deny but *Ratram* ſuppoſes Chriſt's true Body to be Viſible, when he ſaith, it is the very Manifeſtation of the thing; ſome of his Arguments to prove the Sacrament not to be Chriſt's Very Body, are drawn from a Suppoſition, that if it were ſo, it would be a Living, Organical Body, Viſible, Palpable and Manifeſt to our Bodily Senſes: Yet the *Viſibility* of Chriſts glorified Body, is not the thing primarily imported by the word *Manifeſtation*, but its Truth and Reality. As the Apoſtle, ſpeaking of (*f*) God manifeſt in the fleſh, principally deſign'd to teach the *Truth of Chriſt's Incarnation*, that the Word was *truly* made Fleſh, that is, Man, and not that God Viſibly appear'd to Man. And as (*g*) St. *Auſtin*, when he ſaith, The ſame Chriſt who was *Typified* in

(*f*) 1 Tim. 3. 16.

(*g*) *Idem ipſe Chriſtus illis in Petra* figuratus, *nobis in carne manifeſtatus eſt.* Aug. in Pſal. 77.

the

the Rock to the *Jews*, is now *manifested* in the Flesh to us, doth not by that Phrase imply our Saviour's Visible Appearance to us, but that he was *truly and actually* Incarnate for us.

As for his Second Reason to prove that Verity imports not the Reality, but the Sensible Appearance, *viz.* That the Writers of the Middle Age use the word to signifie the Depositions of Witnesses, and the Proof or Evidence of things, I conceive it to be weak and unconcluding. The Instances to which he refers us, are in *M. du Cange*'s (*h*) *Glossary*: And I might tell him, that they are not taken out of Writers of the Middle Age, but the (*i*) Latest Times; but not to insist on that Circumstance, I think that he cannot infer, that Proofs by Witnesses are called Verities, because they clear the Point in dispute, in regard it seems more likely that Depositions (if they are stiled *Verities*) have that name from the Charitable Presumption, that

(*h*) *Glossarii*, Tom. 3. col. 1283.
(*i*) *Scilicet*, A. D. 1228.

every Man hath ſo juſt a reverence of an Oath, that he will ſwear nothing but the *Truth*. I ſay, if Depoſitions are ſtiled *Veritates*, for I conceive the Learned and Induſtrious *M. du Cange* is miſtaken in the ſenſe of the word *Veritas* (*k*) in thoſe Inſtances he makes to prove that it ſignifieth the Depoſition of a Witneſs; and that he more truly expounds it by the Engliſh word *Verdict*, which is the Sentence of the Jury, who are Judges of the Fact, and not Witneſſes, and in thoſe places *Judgments* are ſtiled *Veritates*, according to a known Rule of the Civil Law, that a *judged Caſe* is taken for *Truth*.

His other Inſtances from the Synod of *Coyac*, A. D. 1050. are much more impertinent; for the word *Veritas* is there a Feudal Term, and imports in the former Canon the Title of the Church to its Poſſeſſions, againſt which three years Uſurpation ſhould

(*k*) Veritas, *Depoſitio Teſtis*. Veredictum *J. C. Anglis*, —— Veritate Scabinorum convincatur *Procul dubio hallucinatur*, Veritas Scabinorum. *idem valet quod* Judicium Scabinorum, *ſupra in voce* Scabinus, *ubi ſtatuit Cl. du Cange*, *Scabinos eſſe* Judices urbanos.

not

not preſcribe; and in the latter Canon, the *Homage* and *Fealty* of the Vaſſals to their Lord, and is equivalent to (*l*) *Fidelitas*, which ſignifieth *Faith* and *true Allegiance*. So that *M. Boileau* hath made a great flouriſh with theſe Authorities to no purpoſe.

He tells us moreover that *Paſchaſe* uſeth the word *Veritas* to ſignifie the *Senſible* Truth, but the words cited out of him ſeem plainly to import the *Reality*. They are theſe; (*m*) "Then theſe Myſtical Signs in "our Faith ſhall ceaſe, but the Truth "*in Reality*, which as yet is rightly "celebrated in the Myſtery, ſhall be "ſhewn clearer than the Light, and "that ſhall be evident to all in the "enjoyment which we now receive "in the Myſtery. I conceive *Reipſa*

(*l*) Veritatem, & *Juſtitiam Regis non contemnant, ſed ſicut in diebus Aelfonſi Regis* fideles & *recti perſiſtant, & talem* Veritatem facient *Regi qualem, &c.*

(*m*) *Quando jam ultra non erunt hæc Myſtica Sacramenta in fide; ſed in* REIPSA VERITAS, *quæ adhuc relle agitur in Myſterio luce clarius referetur, & erit omnibus palam in fruitione, quod nunc ſumimus in Myſterio.* Paſch. *apud* Boileau, *p.* 216.

may very aptly be rendred the *Real Truth*, or *Truth in Reality*. Nor doth the latter Clauſe expound the word *Veritas*, but is eaſie to obſerve a double Antitheſis of Myſtical Sacraments to the Real Verity, and of an obſcure Repreſentation to the clear Viſion, which double Antitheſis is ordinary in the Writings of the Fathers, and in this Tract of *Ratram*.

Having thus anſwer'd that *M. Boileau* offers to maintain his Notion, that Verity ſignifieth not the *Reality*, but only the *Senſible* Appearance, I ſhall next prove his Notion not only groundleſs and precarious, but alſo falſe and abſurd, by ſhewing,

1*ſt*. That this Notion of *Verity* is inconſiſtent with *Bertram*'s own Expoſition of that Term in this Treatiſe. And,

2*dly*. That it agrees not with the Uſe of the Word in other Writers of the ſame or elder Times.

I. It is inconſiſtent with *Bertram*'s own Expoſition of the Term in this Treatiſe, who explaineth it very frequently, and by great variety of Expreſſions equivalent to the *Reality* or *very Truth*, as will appear in the following Inſtances.

N. XV.

N. XV. *Verity* is expounded by *Proper Eſſence*; (*n*) They muſt needs confeſs either that they are changed in ſome other reſpect than that of their Bodies, and that in this reſpect they are not what we ſee they are *in Truth*, but ſomewhat elſe which we diſcern them not to be in their *Proper Eſſence*, &c. what he ſtyles *Verity* or *Truth* in one Member of the *Antitheſis*, is called the *Proper Eſſence* in the other, which I take to be equivalent to the *Reality*. In this Paſſage the *Lobe* M.S. varies from the Printed Copies, which read *Exiſtence* inſtead of *Eſſence*, and I think the Variation of ſome moment, and that it is advantageous to the *Proteſtant* Cauſe.

Again, In diſcuſſing the Second Queſtion, he often deſcribes the Real and Natural Body of our Saviour in Terms as clear and expreſs as Human Wit can deviſe, *viz.* His Body born of the Virgin, which ſuffered, was buried, and roſe again: This he

(*n*) *Fatebuntur ergo neceſſe eſt, aut mutata eſſe ſecundum aliud quam ſecundum Corpus, ac per hoc non eſſe hoc quod* in Veritate *videntur, ſed aliud quod non eſſe* ſecundum propriam Eſſentiam *cernuntur. N.* 15.

calleth

calleth our Lord's *True* or *Very* Body, and denieth the Holy Euchariſt to be that Body. For Inſtance, he ſaith that Chriſt's Natural Body (*o*) is no *Myſtery* but *Truth of Nature*, which he denieth the Sacrament to be.

Again, *N.* LXII. The Body which he took of the *Virgin Mary*, which Suffered, was Buried, and Roſe again, was a *True* Body, that is, ſuch as remained Viſible and palpable. But the Body which is called the Myſtery of God, is not Corporeal, but Spiritual; and if Spiritual, then it can neither be ſeen, nor felt. From which words we may learn what *Ratram*'s Notion of a True Body is, *viz.* ſuch as our Senſes judge to be a Body, diſcernible by the ſight and touch. A Real Body, and not a Spirit or Phantaſm. So *N.* LXXII. He deſcribeth Chriſt's to be an Organical Body, animated with a Reaſonable Soul, to be the True or Real Fleſh of a True or Real Man (*p*), A *True* Body in the ſhape of

(*o*) *Non ſit Myſterium ſed Veritas Naturæ*. N. 57

(*p*) Vera *Caro* veri *hominis exiſtebat*, *Corpus* unique Verum *in* Veri *Corporis ſpecie conſiſtens*. N. 72.

a *True* Body, which cannot be affirmed of his Spiritual Fleſh or the Holy Sacrament; which expreſſions moſt evidently import the *Reality*, and not the *Senſible Appearance*. And therefore in denying the Holy Euchariſt to be ſuch a True Body, he denieth the Real Preſence.

Again, He ſometimes expounds *Verity* by *ipſa Res*, the *thing it ſelf*, which is the *Reality*, N. 77. (q) Wherefore that which outwardly appears is *not the thing it ſelf*, but the *Image of it*, but that which the Mind perceives and underſtands is the *Verity of the thing*, or the *very thing it ſelf*. Here *ipſa res*, and *veritas Rei*, are manifeſtly the ſame.

Thus alſo ſpeaking of Chriſts Body in the Sacrament in oppoſition to his *True* Body, he ſaith, that the former (r) is only in *ſome particular manner* [or reſpect] the Body of Chriſt, which manner is *Figurative*,

(q) *Exterius igitur quod apparet, non eſt IPSA RES, ſed Imago REI, mente vero quod ſentitur & intelligitur, Veritas REI*, n. 77.

(r) Secundum quendam modum *Corpus Chriſti eſſe cognoſcitur, & modus iſte in Figura eſt & imagine ut Veritas RES IPSA ſentiatur*, n. 84

and,

and in the way of an Image; ſo that the *Verity* is the THING IT SELF. And again, (*ſ*) The Truth we ſhall then have when the VERY THING it ſelf ſhall appear. And elſewhere comparing the Natural Fleſh of our Lord, with the Holy Euchariſt, which is commonly called his Body, he ſaith, (*t*) This Body is a Pledge and Figure, but that is the TRUTH IT SELF; where we owe the Emphatical Pronoun *ipſa*, to the Lobez MS. He ſaith (*u*) of Chriſt's Natural Body, That it is the very Manifeſtation of the THING, whereas he denied the Holy Euchariſt to be the (*w*) Manifeſtation of the THING IT SELF, *N.* 88. Which two latter Phraſes are perfectly equivalent to the (*x*) Manifeſtation of the TRUTH

(*ſ*) *Veritas vero erit, cum jam nec Pignus, nec Imago; ſed IPSIUS REI veritas apparebit*, n. 87.

(*t*) *Et hoc Corpus Pignus eſt, & Species; illud vero IPSA Veritas.* n. 88.

(*u*) *Sed IPSA REI manifeſtatio cognoſcitur*, n. 97.

(*w*) *Non per IPSIUS REI manifeſtationem*, n. 88.

(*x*) *Ipſius* Veritatis *nuda* manifeſtatione, *n.* 3.

IT

IT SELF, in the Preface of this Tract; and all theſe Expreſſions plainly import the REALITY.

Moreover, He calls our Saviour's Body, born of the Virgin (*y*), his Proper and True Body, having nothing *Myſtical* or *Figurative* in it. So many ſeveral ways is the Term *Verity* explained, and in all the Holy Euchariſt denied to be the True, that is, REAL Body of our Saviour.

Again, The Senſe of the word *Verity*, may be learned from the Terms to which it ſtands oppoſed through the whole Diſcourſe, which manifeſtly declare the ſubject of which they are affirmed, not to be Chriſts *Real* Body. Sometimes it is oppoſed to a *Figure*, now nothing is a Sign or Figure of it ſelf, ſometime to a *Pledge*, ſometime to an *Image*, to a *Similitude*, a *Remembrance*, and the like; and by affirming the Conſecrated Elements to be Chriſt's Body in any of the forementioned reſpects, he virtually denieth them to be his Natural and *Real* Body, and by conſe-

(*y*) *Illud namque* proprium *&* Verum *nihil habens in ſe vel Myſticum vel Figuratum: hoc vero Myſticum.*

quence

quence when he saith they are Christ's Flesh and Blood *in Figure* and not *in Truth*, he must mean thereby, *not in Reality*.

Lastly, If this be not the Sense of that Term, *Ratram*'s Reasoning, *N. 77.* is false and absurd (z). He argues thus; If the Holy Eucharist be Christs Body, and be *truly* and properly said to be the Body of Christ, then it is such in Verity, and if so, then it is Incorruptible impassible, and by consequence Eternal, &c. Now as M. *Boileau* expounds that Term, the former (1) consequence is false, and *Ratram* must contradict himself as our Adversaries understand him. It followeth not, that if the Eucharist be *properly and truly said* to be Christs Body, that therefore it is so in the *sensible appearance*, on the Principles of the Church of *Rome*. Nor is the latter (2) Inference valid, *viz.* That if it be Christs Body in *sensible* Verity, then it is incorruptible and impassible. For the Incorruptibility of

(z) *Si enim*— *hoc vere dicitur quia Corpus Christi est*, (1) *In Veritate Corpus Christi est*; & *si in Veritate Corpus Christi est*, & —
(2) *Incorruptibile est & impassibile*, &c. n. 77.

Christs

Christs Body, depends not upon the Sensible Qualities, but upon its Glorified State. And Christ hath no other Real Body but his Glorified Body. In the state of Humiliation, when he was Scourged, Buffeted, and Crucified, the Body of our Saviour was visible and palpable, and was a *true* Body with all the sensible Appearances of such a Body, yet I am of opinion, that M. *Boileau* will scarce adventure to say, that our Saviour's Body was then Impassible, Incorruptible, or Immortal.

Whereas if the word *Veritas* be taken in its genuine and common Sense, the Consequence is undeniable. For to the Truth of a Proposition it is requisite, that the Prædicate do *really* agree to the Subject, and that the Subject be in *Truth of Nature*, what it is affirmed to be. And whatever the Subject is not *in Reality*, that is either *falsly* or *improperly* affirmed of it.

I hope this may suffice to shew, that *Ratram* did not use the Term in M. *Boileau*'s sense, which is as much as I am obliged to prove. But for the further manifestation of his Extravagance in imposing that signification

tion upon it, I ſhall proceed to let you ſee how contrary it is to the uſage of the word *Verity* in other Eccleſiaſtical Writers of his own and Elder times.

I ſhall give you an Inſtance or two out of *Tertullian*, who in anſwering thoſe Hereticks, who objected againſt the *Reality* of the Incarnation the words of St. *Paul*, Rom. viii. 3. *God ſending his Son in the* LIKENESS *of ſinful Fleſh*, &c. thus expreſſeth himſelf: (*a*) Not that he aſſumed the LIKENESS of FLESH, as if it were the IMAGE of a Body, and not the VERITY, *i. e.* a Real Body. Again, Anſwering an Objection of *Marcion*, who ſaid, That if the Image of God, the Soul ſinned in Man, the Guilt would affect God himſelf. He ſaith, (*b*) The IMAGE muſt not be in all reſpects

(*a*) Non quod Similitudinem Carnis acceperit, quaſi *IMAGINEM* Corporis & non *VERITATEM*: Sed Similitudinem *peccatricis* carnis vult intelligi, &c. *Tertul. de Carne Chriſti*, c. 16.

(*b*) *Porro IMAGO VERITATI haud uſque quaque adæquabitur, aliud enim eſt ſecundum VERITATEM eſſe, aliud IPSAM VERITATEM eſſe*, Adv. Marcion. l. 2. c. 9.

made

made equal with the VERITY, it is one thing to be made after the TRUTH, *i. e.* in imitation of it; and another thing to be the VERY TRUTH it ſelf. Again, He proves that Chriſt had a Real Body, becauſe the Sacrament was a Figure of it. For there could be no Figure, unleſs there were a TRUE Body.

Irenæus doth not only uſe the word in the ſame ſenſe, but eſtabliſheth an Eſſential difference between the Image, and Verity: (c) *A Type and Image*, ſaith he, *is ſometimes in* Matter and Subſtance *different from the* VERITY, or TRUTH, *but it ought to reſemble the Shape and Lineaments thereof.* They differ Subſtantially.

St. *Cyprian* alſo uſeth the Term in the ſame ſenſe, where making the deliverance of the Firſt-born in *Egypt*, whoſe Door-poſts were ſprinkled with the Blood of the Paſchal Lamb, a Type of our Salvation by

(c) *Typus enim & Imago* ſecundum materiam, & ſecundum Subſtantiam *aliquoties a VERITATE diverſus eſt, ſecundum autem habitum & lineamentum debet ſervare ſimilitudinem*, Iren. adv. Hær. l. 2. c. 40.

the Croſs and Paſſion of our Lord, he ſaith, (*d*) *That* [Salvation] *which anciently in the ſlaying of the* [Paſchal] *Lamb went before in the way of an* IMAGE, *is fulfilled in Chriſt, the* TRUTH *which followed after.*

St. *Ambroſe* frequently uſeth VERITAS for the Reality, ſpeaking of boaring the Ear of the Jewiſh Servants, and the Circumciſion of their Fleſh, *&c.* (*e*) *Theſe things are* SIGNS and *not the* TRUTH; which was *Sanctification*, as he tells immediately. And in what ſenſe the word *Verity* muſt be taken when we find it oppoſed to *Signs*, he elſewhere teacheth, ſpeaking of *Abraham*'s Circumciſion; (*f*) The Apoſtle *Paul* ſaid,

---

(*d*) *Quod ante occiſo agno præcedit* in imagine, *impletur in Chriſto, ſecuta poſtmodum* Veritate, Cypr. ad Demetrian, p. 194. Edit. Oxon.

(*e*) *SIGNA ſunt iſta & non VERITAS. Sed ille intelligit qui cor ſuum Spiritali Circumciſione caſtificat, &c.* Ambr. in Pſ. 118. Oct. 13.

(*f*) Abraham *Signum accepit Circumciſionis: Utique SIGNUM non IPSA RES, ſed ait rius rei eſt; hoc eſt, non VERITAS ſed indicium VERITATIS*, de Abraham l. 1. in Gen. c. 17.

that

that *Abraham* received the Sign of Circumciſion, now the SIGN is not the THING IT SELF, but [the Repreſentation] of another Thing, that is, not the TRUTH, but an Indication of the TRUTH. where he not only oppoſeth the TRUTH to a SIGN, but alſo expounds it to be the REALITY.

So *Gaudentius*, Biſhop of *Breſcia*, contemporary with St. *Ambroſe*, ſpeaking of the Paſchal Lamb as a Type of Chriſt's Death, ſaith, (*g*) It was a FIGURE of our Lord's Paſſion, and not the PROPRIETY; now a FIGURE is not the TRUTH or REALITY, but an Imitation of the TRUTH. Here he makes a Figure and the REALITY to be Inconſiſtent, in their very Natures.

I might produce ſeveral Paſſages of St. *Auſtine* to the ſame effect, but ſhall content my ſelf with one or two.

(*g*) *Figura erat, non Proprietas Dominicæ Paſſionis; FIGURA etenim non eſt VERITAS, ſed imitatio VERITATIS.* Gaudent. Brix. Serm. 2. in Exod. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2. Edit. Par. 1610.

(*b*) Having cited thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, *Sacrificium laudis glorificabit me*, &c. He addeth, "The "Fleſh and Blood of this Sacrifice "was promiſed by Typical Victims "before the coming of Chriſt, it "was given in VERY TRUTH "[or Reality] in the Paſſion of "Chriſt, and is celebrated in the "SACRAMENT which is the "MEMORIAL thereof, after "the Aſcenſion of Chriſt. This is a remarkable Paſſage, not only as it gives us the true ſenſe of the word *verity*, but as it declares the Holy Euchariſt to be an Hiſtorical Type of our Saviours Oblation on the Croſs, as the Jewiſh Sacrifices were Prophetical Types thereof; but neither one nor the other his Fleſh and Blood in Reality.

The other place is cited by *Gra-*

(*b*) *Hujus Sacrificii Caro & Sanguis ante adventum Chriſti per victimas* SIMILITUDINUM *promittebatur; in Paſſione Chriſti per* IPSAM VERITATEM *reddebatur: Poſt aſcenſum Chriſti per* SACRAMENTUM MEMORIÆ *celebratur*, Auguſt. contra Fauſtum Manich. l. xx. c. 21.

tian,

tian, whoſe *Decretum* the (*i*) Biſhops met at *Bononia*, in their Advice to Pope *Julius* III. had reaſon (upon account of this and many other Paſſages of the Antient Fathers and Councils no way favourable to Popery extant in that Collection) to call a Pernicious Book. The words occur not in the Works of St. *Auſtine*, but are cited from *Proſper*'s Sentences of St. *Auſtine*, and are cited by *Lanfranc*, and other Zealots for Tranſubſtantiation; I marvel why: And they run thus, (*k*)

(*i*) *Sed animum hic advertat Sanctitas tua; Nam Decretalium, & Sexti & Clementinarum, & Extravagantium tantum ſupra Meminimus, ac non item* Decreti, *quod minime mirum videri debet.* Eſt enim Pernicioſus liber, & *Authoritatem tuam valde imminuit*, &c. Concil. quorundam Epiſc. de ſtabilienda Romana Eccleſ. fol. 5.

(*k*) *Sicut ergo cœleſtis Panis, qui vere Chriſti caro eſt*, ſuo modo *vocatur Corpus Chriſti cum* REVERA *ſit* SACRAMENTUM *Corporis Chriſti, illius videlicet quod Viſibile Palpabile, mortale in cruce eſt ſuſpenſum, vocaturque ipſa immolatio carnis quæ ſacerdotis manibus fit, Chriſti Paſſio, Mors, Crucifixio, non* REI VERITATE *ſed* SIGNIFICANTE MYSTERIO. *Sic*, &c. De Conſecr. diſt. II. c. 48. Sect. ſicut.

" Therefore as the Heavenly Bread " which is truly the Fleſh of Chriſt, " is [*ſuo modo*] in its peculiar man- " ner called the Body of Chriſt, " though in REALITY, it is the " SACRAMENT of Chriſt's Bo- " dy, namely of that [Body] which " was Viſible, Palpable, Mortal, and " Hanged on the Croſs; and the very " Immolation of his Fleſh by the " hands of the Prieſt is called the " Paſſion, Death, and Crucifixion of " Chriſt, not [that it is ſo] in " VERITY of NATURE, but " in MYSTICAL SIGNIFI- " CATION.

And the Gloſs is very extraordinary; (*l*) *The Heavenly Sacrament which* truly repreſents *the Body of Chriſt, is called the Body of Chriſt but* improperly.— *So that the meaning is, it is called the Body of Chriſt, that is, it* ſignifies *it.*

(*l*) *Cæleſte Sacramentum quod VERE REPRÆSENTAT Chriſti carnem dicitur Corpus Chriſti, ſed IMPROPRIE, unde dicitur SUO MODO, ſed non REI VERITATE, ſed ſignificati MYSTERIO, ut ſit ſenſus, Vocatur Corpus Chriſti, id eſt SIGNIFICAT. Gloſſa in verbum* Cæleſtis.

I ſhall make two or three brief Remarks on this Paſſage.

1. As *Bertram* (*m*) ſaith of the Holy Euchariſt, that it is *in ſome reſpect*, or in ſome *particular manner*, the Body and Blood of Chriſt; ſo here it is ſaid to be in a *peculiar way* called Chriſt's Body, though (*n*) *in Reality* it is only the Sacrament thereof.

2. As *Bertram* declares that manner and reſpect to be *Figurative*, and in the way of *an Image*, ſo here the Holy Euchariſt is ſaid to be, as the Gloſs teacheth us, (*o*) *improperly* ſo called, it being the Body of Chriſt only in Myſtical ſignification, not in Verity of Nature.

3. That *verity* when oppoſed in Sacramental Diſcourſes to Signs, Myſteries, Figures, Pledges, Images, and the like, imports *Reality*, or Truth of Nature.

But to come nearer *Bertram*'s time,

(*m*) *Secundum quid, ſecundum quendam modum Corpus Chriſti eſſe cognoſcitur & Modus iſte in Figura eſt, & in Imagine*, N. 84.

(*n*) REVERA.

(*o*) *Sed improprie.*

the Venerable *Bede*, (p) hath a Paſſage in which he expounds the Truth to be the THING it ſelf. Having mentioned the Reſurrection, he proceeds, "When all the Elect ſhall feaſt "on the Fleſh of the Immaculate "Lamb, that is, of our God and "Lord; no longer exerciſing Faith "in the Sacrament, but beholding "him in REALITY, and in "TRUTH.

I ſhall cloſe all with a Manuſcript Prayer, which I found among the *Saxon MSS.*(q) of Arch-Biſhop *Laud*'s gift to the Publick Library at *Oxford*, which was Copied by that Induſtrious Collector of *Saxon* Monuments, Mr. *Liſle*, from a MS. Rule of Nuns, in *Bennet* Colledge Library (r) in *Cambridge*, which I have gotten com-

---

(p) *Cum omnes electi carne agni immaculati, id eſt, Dei & Domini noſtri, non amplius in Sacramento credentes ſed in* REIPSA & VERITATE *videntes, reficiëntur*, Beda in Eſdram l. 2. c. 8.

(q) *In libro cui titulus* Anglo-Saxon Remaines *ad calcem Pſalterii Saxonici Anglice redditi per M.* Liſle. Quarto Cod. 1249.

(r) *In Biblioth. Coll. S.* Bened. Cod. 274. pag. 16. *vide titulum apud* James, Eclege Oxonio Cantab. p. 89.

pared

pared with the Original, and is found exactly to agree with it.

The Title.

Another to be ſaid at receiving the Sacrament of the Aulter.

Concede, quæſumus, Omnipotens Deus, ut quem enigmatice *&* ſub aliena Specie *cernimus quo* Sacramentaliter *cibamur in Terris*, facie ad faciem *eum videamus, eo ſicuti eſt VERACITER, & REALITER frui mereamur in Cœlis. Per eund.*

Grant, we beſeech thee Almighty God, that him who we ſee darkly and under another Species, on whom we *feed Sacramentally* on Earth, we may behold Face to Face, and enjoy him TRULY and REALLY as he is in Heaven, Through, *&c.*

The Antiquity or Author of this Prayer I know not, but I believe it may be ſomewhat more Ancient than the *Saxon* Prayers among which I found it; which I believe to be, as Dr. *James* ſaith, later than the Conqueſt by the Language, which is much nearer *Engliſh*, than *Elfric*'s Sermon.

The Prayer is a plain Alluſion to thoſe words of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 13. 12.

13.12.(s) *now we ſee as in a glaſs darkly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then ſhall I know even as alſo I am known.* And the Alluſion makes it apparent that the Author of the Prayer did not believe the Real or Oral Manducation of Chriſt in the Sacrament.

The words, (t) *whom we ſee darkly and under another Species*, are of the ſame importance with thoſe of (u) St. *Paul*, as *in a glaſs, darkly*, which import not the *direct* and immediate Viſion of the *thing it ſelf*, but an obſcure and reflex Viſion of it by an Image; ſo the Author of the Commentaries on St. *Paul's Epiſtles*, that go under the Name of (w) St. *Ambroſe*, "It is plain that now we be-"hold *Images* by Faith, but then "[we ſhall ſee] *the very things themſelves.* And as *Tertullian* (x) inter-

(s) Ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι.

(t) *Quem ænigmatice & ſub aliena ſpecie cernimus.*

(u) *Per ſpeculum in ænigmate.*

(w) *Apertum eſt nunc* Imagines *videri per* Fidem, *tunc* Res ipſas. *Ambroſ. in Loc.*

(x) *Tertul. Adv. Praxtam*, cap. 14. Non in ænigmate, id eſt, non in imagine. *Ænigma*, Figura, *ſive* Typus, *ſive* Sprcies. *Iſidor. in Gloſſis.*

prets

prets the word which our Translators render darkly, *in an Image*, and as Ecclesiastical Writers commonly style the Types of the Old Law, (*y*) *Ænigmata*, so the Sacramental Symbols are called (*z*) *Ænigmatical vails*; so that the former Antithesis imports a denial that the Visible Object is the TRUE Body of Christ. And then the latter Antithesis between the Sacramental feeding on him here on Earth, and the True and Real enjoyment of him in Heaven, as plainly implieth, that it is the Sacrament, and not the Real Body of Christ, which is Orally received, and our Spiritual repast *on Earth*, and that the TRUE and REAL enjoyment of Christ is reserved for our entertainment in Heaven. These things I thought good briefly to observe: but the design on which I cited this Prayer, is only to prove, (*a*) that TRULY and REALLY

(*y*) *Veteris literæ putruerunt ænigmata. Autor de Unctione Chrismatis apud Cyprianum.* Vide Origen. Hom. 7. in Num.

(*z*) Ἀμφιέσματα τῶν αἰνιγμάτων. Dion. Areop. de Hierarch. cap. 3.

(*a*) *Veraciter & realiter, conjunctio & exegeticè usurpatur.*

are

are Terms equivalent, and here the former is expounded by the latter.

I have been the more prolix on this Term, becauſe *M. Boileau* layeth the ſtreſs of the whole Controverſie upon its true Senſe, in which I perſuade my ſelf that any impartial Reader muſt needs perceive him to have been groſly miſled by Prejudice.

I ſhall now proceed to ſhew how groſs an Errour he is guilty of in expounding another Term of no leſs moment in this Controverſie, which is the word SPECIES, which he makes to ſignifie the (*b*) *Appearance, and not the Subſtance and Nature of things*, in which Expoſition, if I prove him deceived, he muſt for ever renounce his confident claim of *Ratram* for a Patron of Tranſubſtantiation.

Let us then, before we offer any thing to evince the contrary, ſee

(*b*) *Il ſignifie* apparence, & *non pas la Subſtance & la Nature des choſes, comme les Philoſophes le prennent ordinairement. Præf. p.* 41. *Remarq. p.* 220, & *p.* 250. *Il n'entend pas la Verite de la Nature —— mais ſeulement —— ce que l'on appelle les Accidents qui tombent ſous le ſens. p.* 253, 254.

what

what Proof *M. Boileau* brings to make out his Aſſertion, that by *Species* in this Tract muſt be underſtood, the *Senſible Apearance* or *Accidents*, and not the *Nature* or *Subſtance of things*. Now for Proof hereof, he ſends the Reader to his Remarks, and upon a careful peruſal of the places to which he refers, I proteſt, I cannot obſerve the leaſt Shew or Appearance either of Reaſon or Authority to countenance the ſenſe which he impoſeth on the Term: and the Truth is, I have always had more trouble to find out his Arguments, than to Anſwer them.

The former of the two places to which he refers, is a Remark on theſe words. (c) *It is well known that the* Species *of the Creature remains in Truth what it was before.* This Paſſage, I confeſs, deſerved a Remark, and unleſs our Tranſlator make out his ſenſe of *Species* very clearly, it will ſtand in direct Oppoſition to the *Trent* Doctrine, *That the Subſtance of Bread and*

(c) *Rem. p.* 220. *on n.* xii: *Quoniam ſecundum veritatem Species creaturæ quæ fuerat ante, permanſiſſe cognoſcitur.*

Wine

Wine remain not after Conſecration.

To clear this Paſſage, he therefore cites another by which it may be expounded, in which *Ratram* ſaith, (*d*) *That we ſee not the Form or Appearance of Fleſh and Blood in this Myſtery.* How honeſtly that Paſſage is thus rendred by him, hath been already ſhewn; but how he proves *Species* in that place to ſignifie *Appearance* I am ſtill to learn; for as I noted before, *unda cruoris* imports the *Liquid Subſtance* of Blood, and gives us fair ground to conclude that *Species Carnis* ſignifieth the *Subſtance*, and not the meer Accidents of Fleſh.

He further addeth, (*e*) That *Ratram* learnt this uſe of the word from the Books of the Sacraments aſcribed to St. *Ambroſe*, whence he cites this Paſſage following for an Example of it. (*f*) The Holy Ghoſt deſcended from Heaven in the Species or like-

---

(*d*) *Non enim ſecundum quod videtur, vel* carnis Species *in illo pane cognoſcitur, vel in illo vino* Cruoris unda *monſtratur.* num. x.

(*e*) *Rem.* p. 220.

(*f*) *Spiritus enim Sanctus in Specie Columbæ, non in Veritate columbæ—— deſcendit de Cælo.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

neſs

neſs of a Dove, not in the Verity or Real Subſtance of a Dove. I freely grant the word in this place imports the *Likeneſs* or *Appearance* in oppoſition to *Truth of Nature*, but then withal, I deny that it ſignifieth any thing like what they make *Species* of Bread and Wine in the Holy Euchariſt to be. It doth not import all the Senſible Qualities of a True Dove, which was miraculouſly converted into the Holy Ghoſt; nor yet doth it imply the *Senſible Accidents* of a Dove exiſting, without a Subject. For though the generality of the Fathers are expreſs in denying the Holy Spirit to have aſſumed the Nature or Real Body of a Dove, yet ſome of them (*g*) make him to have aſſumed a Body like a Dove formed of Air condenſed; of which matter, it is

(*g*) *Surgenti manifeſta Dei præſentia claret*
Scinditur auricolor cœli ſeptemplicis æthra
Corporeamq; *gerens* Speciem, *deſcendit ab alto*
Spiritus, aeream *fimulans* in nube *columbam*.
Juvencus *Evang. Hiſt. l.* 1. *inter Poet. Vet. Eccleſ. Baſil.* 1564. *in Quarto.*

Non tamen de avibus ſumpſiſſe columbam, ſed ex aere *minime dubitatur.* l. 3. *de mirabil. Script.* c. 5. *apud* Auguſt. *Tom.* 3.

ordinarily

ordinarily believed, the Bodies aſſumed by Angels do conſiſt. And if ſo, the Accidents which affect the Senſes have a Real and Corporeal, as the Colours and Features of a well-made Effigies ſubſiſt in a Real Subject, though not in the Very Perſon whom it reſembles. So that this Citation is no Authority for the ſenſe he impoſeth on the Term, and upon examination of theſe Books, whence he makes *Bertram* to have learn'd this uſe of the word *Species*, many undeniable Examples of its being uſed for the Subſtance and Specifick Nature will appear.

This is all the Proof he offers, unleſs the *ipſe dixit* of a *Sorbon* Doctor muſt paſs for a Demonſtration; (*b*) the other Remark to which he ſends us, contains neither Argument nor Authority to bear out his Expoſition of that Term.

I ſhall therefore now take leave to enquire into the true ſenſe thereof, and in a ſhort Digreſſion give a probable Account how it came into uſe with Eccleſiaſtick Authors. And

(*b*) Ad *num.* 54.

had

had *M. Boileau* taken the ſame method to ſearch out the true meaning of *Species*, which he took to juſtifie his forced Interpretation of *Veritas*, that is, had been pleaſed to conſult the Learned *M. du Cange*, I might have ſpared my pains. From him he might have learn'd, that it is (*i*) a Term wherewith the Lawyers are well acquainted, and ſignifieth all that the Ancient Latin Writers include in the Notion of *Fruges*, Wine, Oyl, Corn, Pulſe, *&c.* And the *Gloſſary* at the end of the *Theodoſian Code*, publiſhed by *Gothofred*, extende its Signification (*k*) to all Neceſſaries of Life, Tributes, Publick Stores of Proviſions, and not only for the Belly, but the Back alſo, Rich Cloaths, and Houſhold-ſtuff, Jewels, as alſo Materials for Building, Timber and Iron, paſſing by that Name in both the *Theodoſian* and *Juſtinian* Codes,

(*i*) Species. *Vox J. C. notiſſima, quibus idem ſonat quod veteribus fruges, &c.* Gloſſar. Tom. 3. *col.* 918.

(*k*) *Species ſunt res ſeu corpora quæcunque quorum uſus eſt aliquis in humana converſatione, & quidem quæ tributi annonarumque nomine Fiſco penduntur.* Gloſſar. Nomic. tit. Species.

in the Writers of the Imperial Hiſtory, *Vegetius*, *Caſſiodorus* &c. In the Theodoſian Code there are many Laws concerning the publick Species, *(l)* requiring them to be brought in kind, and not a compoſition for them in Mony; Particularly that the *(m) Species of Wine* be paid in Kind: There are Laws to compel all Farmers to furniſh their proportions of all Species, to oblige Men, and Ships, and Wagons for the Carriage of them to *Rome* and other places, Laws alſo directing the mixing of ſweet and freſh, with the Species decayed and corrupted by long lying in publick Granaries and Cellars. *Caſſiodorus (n)* in his Epiſtles iſſues out orders for the providing of the Species, (1) of *Bacon*, (2) *wheat* (3,4) *Cheeſe*, *wine*, and (5) *Iron*. And the Law-Notion of

(*l*) *Tributa in ipſis ſpeciebus inferri. Non ſunt pretia Specierum, ſed ipſæ quæ poſtulantur Species inferendæ*, Cod. Theod. l. xi. Tit. 2. Leg. 4.

(*m*) *Speciem Vini*, *Ibid.* Leg. 2.

(*n*) 1. *Speciem Laridi*, lib. 2. Ep. 12. (2.) *Tritici Speciem*, l. 3. Ep. 41. *Vini*, *tritici*, *panici Speciem*, l. 12. Ep. 26. *Vini*, *olei vel tritici Species*, l. 12. Ep. 23.

(3. 4.) *Caſei & Vini Palmatiani — Species*, l. 12. Ep. 12. (5.) *De ferro*, l. 3. Ep. 25. *Convenit itaque hanc Speciem diligenti indagatione rimari.*

the

the *Term*, I conceive took its riſe, from the great variety of Neceſſaries of ſeveral ſorts and kinds, that are requiſite for the ſubſiſtance of Armies, or great Cities, or elſe from the variety of ſuch Proviſions paid in the Nature of Rents or Tribute.

Now as the word Sacrament is generally acknowledged to be a term borrowed from the *Roman* Military Laws, ſo probably was the word *Species*; and as Corn and Wine and other ſtores for the publick uſe either of the Prince, the City, or Army go by that Name, eſpecially what came in by way of Penſion (*o*) or Tribute, ſo it is not unlikely that the Oblations of the Faithful brought to the Altar, as a Tribute to God, for the uſe of his Holy Table conſiſting of Bread and Wine, the two main ſupports of Life, might in alluſion thereunto be called Species by Eccleſiaſtick Writers.

Now this premiſed, I ſhall attempt to ſhew two things 1. That *Species* in *Bertram*, imports the ſame thing,

(*o*) *Species præterea, quæ menſis Regiis apparentur,— perquiris*, l. 12. Ep. 18.

which 'its uſed to ſignifie in the firſt (p) of *Geneſis* by the Author of the Vulgar Latin Verſion, *viz.* the *Specifick Nature*, the Subſtance as well as the Appearance.

2. That the word bears the ſame ſenſe in other Authors, and particularly in the Books *de Sacramentis* falſly aſcribed to St. *Ambroſe*.

To evince the former I ſhall preſent you with ſome paſſages, which will appear very abſur'd, if the word be underſtood in Mr. *Boileau*'s ſenſe. And I ſhall begin with that, on which he himſelf hath beſtowed a Remark. (q) *For 'its well known that*, the Species *of the Creature, remains in Truth what it was before*. Now if by *Species* we are with Mr. *Boileau*, to underſtand the ſenſible Appearance, theſe abſurdities will follow.

1. *Ratram* will contradict himſelf, in what he had ſaid in the very Sentence next before. *viz.* (r) That in the Sacrament nothing is changed by

(p) *Beſtias terræ juxta* Species *ſuas*, *Gen.* l. 25.

(q) *Quoniam ſecundum veritatem Speeies Creaturæ quæ fuerat ante permanſiſſe cognoſcitur*, n. 12.

(r) *Hic quoque non iſte tranſitus* [*ſc. ab eſſe ad non eſſe*] *factus eſſe cognoſcitur*, Ibid.

way

way of *Corruption*, nothing paſſeth from being into a ſtate of *Non Exiſtence*: If in theſe words he intended only to affirm, that the Accidents of Bread and Wine, and not their Subſtance do remain after Conſecration. How can he ſay that nothing here is Corrupted, if he thought that Accidents only remained, and that their *Specifick Nature* periſhed?

2. Whereas *Ratram* propoſeth a diſtinction conſiſting of three Members, if *Species* import only the ſenſible Qualities, the two latter Members will be Coincident. For in the next Paragraph, (ſ) he proves there is no alteration, becauſe we perceive no *Alteration* either as to Touch, Colour, or Taſt. Now if in the preceeding Paragraph he deſigned only to Aſſert, that the ſenſible Qualities remain after Conſecration; I deſire to be informed what other ſenſible qualities the Holy Elements have beſides thoſe here mentioned?

3. It is plain that as paſſing from *Non Entity* into being, is a ſubſtantial

(ſ) *Nihil enim hic vel* tactu *vel* colore *vel* ſapore *permutatum eſſe deprehenditur*, n. 13.

Change, ſo the contrary is a ſubſtantial Change, whereas if *Species* do not import the ſubſtance, inſtead of the univerſally received diſtinction of two ſorts of Subſtantial Mutation, and one Accidental, he makes *Ratram* the Author of a Novel and unknown Diſtinction of two kinds of Accidental Mutation, and one Subſtantial. And I might add, that the Emphatical word *in Truth*, which I take to ſignifie *verity of Nature* muſt ſtand for juſt nothing; whereas the true meaning of the place is, "That the Creatures of Bread and Wine remain "*in Reality* after Conſecration what "they were before.

Again, (t) *They are Figures in reſpect of the Viſible* Species: In this place if we underſtand him of the Senſible Qualities, the Aſſertion is falſe, for it is the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, which have any reſemblance of the Body and Blood of Chriſt; the Accidents have no Analogy to it, or the Benefits of our Saviours Death. It is not Whiteneſs, or Roundneſs, or Drineſs, or Moiſtneſs,

(t) *Figuræ ſunt ſecundum ſpeciem viſibilem*, n. 49.

but

but the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine which feeds the Body, and therefore aptly repreſents the Spiritual *Improvements* which the Soul finds in the worthy participation of the Holy Euchariſt; and therefore what *Ratram* calls the Viſible *Species* in the former part of the Paragraph, is ſtiled the Viſible Creature in the latter.

Again, (*u*) where he tells us, That the Fleſh in which Chriſt ſuffered was no *Myſtery*, but the *Truth of Nature*, whereas his Body in the Holy Euchariſt is not Fleſh in *Specie*, but in Sacrament or Myſtery, for in Specie its Bread: There will be no Antitheſis unleſs we underſtand him to deny the Sacrament to be Fleſh, in the ſame ſenſe wherein he affirmed his Body born of the Virgin to be Fleſh, *viz.* in verity of Nature.

Alſo where he declareth, (*w*) That

(*u*) *Quod illa Caro ſecundum quam & Crucifixus eſt Chriſtus & ſepultus, non ſit* Myſterium, *ſed* Veritas Naturæ; *hæc vero Caro quæ nunc ſimilitudinem illius in Myſterio continet, non ſit* Specie *caro ſed* Sacramento. *Si quidem in* Specie *Panis eſt*, &c. n. 57.

(*w*) *Aſt nunc Sanguis Chriſti, quem Credentes ebibunt. & Corpus quod comedunt, aliud ſunt in ſpecie, & aliud in ſignificatione*, n. 69.

what the Faithful do Orally receive, is one thing in Specie, *and another* in Signification; if Species imply only the outward appearance, the Antitheſis is frigid and without force. For in Sacramental Diſcourſes, Things are oppoſed to their Myſtical ſignification, ſo that the force of ſuch Antitheſis lies in the difference between the Being, the *Eſſence*, the *Subſtance*, and the *Signification*, to which they ſtand oppoſed.

This I ſhall make very plain from two or three Authorities of St. *Auſtin*, (*x*) ſpeaking of Sacraments, he ſaith, That they are ſigns of Things, which ſigns ARE one thing, and ſignifie another: There Exiſtence or Being, and ſignifying are oppoſed.

Again, (*y*) Therefore it is ſaid that Rock WAS Chriſt, he did not ſay

---

(*x*) *Quoniam ſigna ſunt rerum, aliud EXISTENTIA & aliud SIGNIFICANTIA*, Aug. contra Maximin. l. 3. c. 22.

(*y*) *Hinc eſt quod dictum eſt, Petra* erat *Chriſtus; non enim dixit Petra* ſignificat *Chriſtum, ſed tanquam hoc eſſet, quod utique per SUBSTANTIAM hoc non erat, ſed per SIGNIFICATIONEM*, Aug. Quæſt. ſuper Levit. 57.

it

it SIGNIFIED Chriſt, as though it had been what indeed it was not in SUBSTANCE, but in SIGNIFICATION; what *Ratram* called Species, St. *Auguſtin* calleth Subſtance.

And if any doubt it, I hope to ſatisfie him by a third Authority, where affirming that the Fathers and We had the ſame Spiritual Meat and Drink, he explains himſelf, in what ſenſe he called it the ſame, (z) *viz.* The ſame in SIGNIFICATION, not in SPECIE or *Subſtance.* And to theſe I might add the Teſtimony cited by *Ratram*, N. 78. where he ſtates the difference in the ſame Terms.

Now by this we may underſtand what he means, when above, *N.* 54. (a) he ſaith, That Bread and Wine continue in the ſame *Species*, that is,

---

(z) *Idem itaque in Myſterio cibus & potus illorum qui noſter, ſed* SIGNIFICATIONE *idem, non* SPECIE, Aug. in Pſ. 77. *Aliud illi, aliud nos, ſed* Specie viſibili, *quod tamen hoc idem* ſignificaret, virtute Spirituali, n. 78. ex Tract. 26. in Joan.

(a) *Panis & Vinum prius extitere, in qua etiam* Specie, *jam conſecrata permanere videntur*, n. 54.

Speci-

Specifick Nature after Conſecration, which they had before; though that place is clear enough without borrowing Light hence; for what is here called Species, is in the ſentence immediately preceding called (*b*) the *Subſtance of the Creatures*; ſo that *Species* here is what *Ratram* in a place before cited out of another Work of his, (*c*) calleth the *Species of its Subſtance*. And as in this Tract, by the (*d*) *Species* in which Chriſt's Natural Body *conſiſted*, he meant a REAL Humane Body; ſo in this place, *N.* 54. where he ſaith the Conſecrated Elements, *were Bread and Wine before*, and conſiſt, or remain in the ſame *Species* after Conſecration, he muſt neceſſarily mean, that they continue REAL Bread and Wine.

(*b*) *Nam ſecundum creaturarum ſubſtantiam quod fuerunt ante Conſecrationem, hoc & poſtea conſiſtunt*, &c.

(*c*) *In ſubſtantiæ ſuæ ſpecie*, Ratr. de Præd. lib. 2.

(*d*) *Corpus in quo ſemel paſſus eſt Chriſtus, non aliam* Speciem *præferebat quam in qua conſiſtebat*, n. 69. *id eſt quam eam Speciem in qua conſiſtebat, quæ eſt natura ſpecifica.*

There

There are other Paſſages, where the (e) *Species* and *Virtue*, and the Corporeal (f) *Species* and Spiritual *Fruit*, ſtand oppoſed which would illuſtrate this Matter, which I paſs over, that I be not tedious to the Reader. And ſhall only add,

That if in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, *Species* had born M. *Boileau*'s ſenſe, and our *Saxon* Anceſtors had believed nothing but the *Appearances* of Bread and Wine to remain, it had been of great moment carefully to have expreſſed it in thoſe very Terms, in Tranſlating the 72 Paragraph of *Bertram*, where he ſaith, the Spiritual Body of Chriſt, [*as to the Species it outwardly bears*] is made of ſeveral Grains of Wheat by the Bakers hand, *&c.* Whereas *Ælfric* in rendring that place, omits the words (g) *Secundum ſpeciem quam gerit exterius*, and ſaith without any

---

(e) *Intelliges quod non in* SPECIE, *ſed in* VIRTUTE *Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti exiſtunt, quæ cernuntur*, n. 56.

(f) N. 93, 94. Speciem *corporalem*, & Fructum *ſpiritualem*.

(g) See the Saxon Hom. Fol. 35, 36.

ſuch

ſuch reſtriction, or limiting Expoſition, *That Chriſt's Spiritual Body which we call the Houſel, is gathered of many Corns* (*h*) *without Blood*, &c. Where by the way alſo obſerve, that our *Saxon* Anceſtors held not the Doctrin of that Concomitance which was deviſed ſince, to juſtifie the Sacrilegious Practice of depriving the People of the Cup.

I ſhall now conſider in what ſenſe the word *Species* is uſed by other Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

I will begin with *Tertullian*, the moſt Antient of the *Latin* Fathers, who expounds the word *Species* by *Res* and *Veritas*. For Inſtance (*i*), *Walking by Faith and not by* Species, that is, ſaith he, in Hope and not in [Fruition of] the thing. And elſewhere, having occaſion to quote, *Numb.* 12. 8. in which place God expreſſeth his extraordinary favour to *Moſes*, and promiſeth to admit him, to more familiar Converſation with himſelf, than he would other Pro-

---

(*h*) Buton blode.

(*i*) *Per fidem incedentes, non per Speciem, id eſt, ſpe, non Re*, Tertul. de Reſ. Carn. c. 43.

phets;

phets; he thus gloſſeth upon the words (*k*): "To him will I ſpeak "Mouth to Mouth, *in Specie*, that is, "*in Truth*, and not Ænigmatically, "that is, *in an Image*.

Likewiſe *Origen*, or ſome (*l*) *Latin* Writer, whoſe Homilies on the Book of *Numbers* are found among *Origens* Works, expounding the ſame place, doth at leaſt ten times over make *Species* to import *Truth*, and *Ænigma* the *Type* or *Figure*. Hereof take theſe Inſtances,(*m*) Thoſe things which were formerly deſigned in the way of an Image, are now fulfilled in *Reality* and *Truth*. And again,

---

(*k*) *Os ad os loquar illi* in Specie, *id eſt*, *in* Veritate, *& non in ænigmate, id eſt, non* in imagine, Adv. Praxeam. c. 14. *vide etiam Contra Marcion.* l. 4. c. 22. *in* Specie *utique hominis quam geſturus erat.*—

(*l*) *Hoc liquet ex* Hom. 18. *ubi hæc leguntur.* In Libro qui apud *NOS* quidem inter Salomonis volumina haberi ſolet, & Eccleſiaſticus, dici: apud *GRÆCOS* vero ſapientia Jeſu filii Sirach appellatur.

(*m*) *Lex Dei jam non in figuris & in imaginibus ſicut prius, ſed* in ipſa Specie veritatis *agnoſcitur*: *Et quæ prius in* ænigmate *deſignabant, nunc in* Specie & Veritate *complentur*, Origen. Hom. VII. in Numeros.

(*n*) You

(*n*) You ſee how *Paul* cleareth the *Figures of the Law*, and teacheth the *Things ſignified* by thoſe Figures. (*o*) Antiently there was a *Figurative Baptiſm*, in the Cloud and in the Sea, now there is *True Regeneration* in Water and the Holy Ghoſt. In all the forementioned Inſtances the word Species doth import the *very Thing*, the *Reality*, the *Truth*, and not the Appearance.

In other Authors it implieth the *Creature*, alſo the *kind*, or *ſort* of Creatures, in conformity to the uſe of the word in the *Roman* Laws, or the *Natural Subſtance*.

Gaudentius (*p*) ſaith, "Likewiſe is "our Saviour's Blood fitly ſet forth "by the *Species*, [or Creature] of "Wine, becauſe that he himſelf in

---

(*n*) *Vides quomodo* ænigmata legis *Paulus abſolvit*, & Species ænigmatum *docet*, Ibid.

(*o*) *Antea* in ænigmate *fuit baptiſmus in nube & in mari, nunc autem* in Specie *regeneratio eſt in aqua & in Spiritu Sancto*, Ibid.

(*p*) *Recte etiam* Vini Specie *tum ſanguis ejus exprimitur, quia cum ipſe in Evangelio dicit*, Ego ſum Vitis Vera, *ſatis declarat, ſanguinem ſuum eſſe, omne* Vinum *quod in* Figura Paſſionis *ejus offertur*, Gaudent. Brix. ad Neophyl. Serm. 2. Bibl. Pat. tom. 2. Edit. Par. 1610.

"his

" his Goſpel, by ſaying *I am the true* " *Vine* doth ſufficiently declare, that " all the Wine which is offered in " the Figure [or Sacrament] of his " Paſſion, is his Blood. Here *Species Vini*, and *Vinum* are the ſame, and ſignifie the *Natural ſubſtance of Wine*, and not the meer Appearances and ſenſible Qualities thereof.

Salvian (*q*) uſeth the word *Species* for the *Natural Subſtance* of Water, in the place already produced upon another occaſion.

Iſidore of *Sevil* ſaith, (*r*) After the *Species* of Sea and Earth, you read that two great Luminaries were Created. Species there ſignifieth the *Creatures of Sea and Earth.*

What St. *Auſtin* (*ſ*) meant by the *Viſible Species* in the Sacrament, which he oppoſeth to the *Spiritual Fruit*, in a Paſſage cited and expounded by *Bertram*, who addeth that *the Viſible*

(*q*) *Speciem* ſervantes, *naturam* relinquentes, lib. 1. de Gub.

(*r*) Poſt *Speciem* Maris & Terræ. formata duo Luminaria *magna*— *legis*, Iſid. Hiſp. de Ordine Creat. c. 5.

(*ſ*) Aug. *Serm. ad Infantes apud Fulgent. de* Bapt. Æthiopis.

Species

Species feedeth the Body; may be beſt learn'd from himſelf in the ſame Sermon, where he hath theſe words. "(t) As to the making the *Viſible* "*Species* of Bread, many Grains of "Corn are moulded into one Maſs; "as it is ſaid of the Faithful in the "Holy Scripture, that they had one "Soul and one Heart, ſo, my Bre-"thren, conſider how the Wine is "made one Body. Many Grapes "hang on the Bunch, but the Juice "of thoſe Grapes is preſſed together "into one [Body of Liquor.] Thus "our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath ſignified "US, [*viz.* the Body of Believers,] "and would that we ſhould belong to "him, [that is, as Members of the "Myſtical Body, whereof he is Head,] "and hath conſecrated the Myſtery

(t) *Sicut enim ut ſit Species Viſibilis panis, multa grana in unum conſperguntur; tanquam illud fiat quod de Fidelibus ait Scriptura Sancta, Erat illis anima & Cor unum in Deum: Sic & de vino, fratres, recolite unde ſit unum. Grana multa pendent ad botrum; ſed liquor granorum in unitate confunditur. Ita Dominus Jeſus Chriſtus NOS ſignificavit, NOS ad SE pertinere voluit. Myſterium Pacis & Unitatis noſtræ in ſua menſa conſecravit.*

"of

" of our Peace and Unity on his own " Table.

There are ſeveral things to be Remarked from this Paſſage, 1. That he ſaith, the *viſible ſpecies* of *Bread* is made up of many Corns moulded together, and made up into one Lump. Now this cannot be ſaid of the *Accidents*, but of the *Subſtance* of *Bread*, made up into one Loaf before Conſecration. For in another place, (*u*) he uſeth the ſame Expreſſion, with relation to *Unconſecrated Bread*; *Which*, ſaith he, *after it is by the hands of Men brought to that* Viſible Species, is not Sanctified, and made ſo great a Sacrament, but by the Inviſible Operation of God's Spirit.

2. When he comes to ſpeak of the Sacramental Wine, he doth not call it the *Viſible Species* of Wine, but ſimply *Wine*; which is an Argument, that by the *viſible Species* of Bread, he meant real Bread.

3. St. *Auſtin* makes the *viſible Species* of Bread, to be a Figure of the Unity of the Faithful among

(*u*) *Quod cum per manus hominum ad illam* Viſibilem Speciem *perducitur, non Sanctificatur ut ſit tam magnum Sacramentum*, &c. de Trin. l. 3. c. 4.

themſelves, as alſo of their Union with Chriſt their Head. Now the meer Appearances of Bread and Wine have no reſemblance of many Members compacted into one Body, the Figure, Colour, or Taſte of the Conſecrated Elements, ſuggeſt not the leaſt hint of the Union of the ſeveral Members of Chriſt's Myſtical Body, whereas their Natural Subſtances are very apt and lively Repreſentations thereof.

4. *Bertram* (w) expounding *St. Auſtin*, aſcribeth an effect to the *Corporeal Species*, which cannot be wrought by the Senſible Appearances ſevered from their Subject; he ſaith, *They feed the Body*, which is Nouriſhed only by ſubſtantial Food, digeſted and turned into its own Subſtance: Now how meer Accidents can be converted into Chyle and Blood, and become ſubſtantial Fleſh is inconceivable, whereas how this may be effected by true Bread and Wine, it is very eaſie to apprehend.

(w) N. 94. *Exterius quod videtur, ſpeciem habet corpoream quæ paſcit corpus.*

Cæſarius

Cæsarius (x) Bishop of *Arles*, hath a Passage very like this of St. *Austin*, "Also in that the Bread is made of "innumerable Grains of Wheat; "its certain, that it signifieth the "Unity of the People. For thus, "Wheat carefully made clean and "prepared, is by the Mill brought "to a *white Species*, and by Water and "Fire united into the substance of "one Loaf. Thus also various Peo-"ple, and divers Nations agreeing "in one Faith, make up of them-"selves one Body of Christ. Doubt-less, the *Species* spoken of by this Father, is not the *bare Appearance*, but the *Substance* of Meal: And before, where he speaks of the (y) *Species of Manna*, he must be understood of the *thing it self*.

(x) *Etiam in hoc ipso, quod innumerosis tritici granis confici novimus, unitatem constat assignari populorum. Sic enim frumentum solita purgantis solicitudine præparatum in candidam Speciem molarum labore perficitur, ac per aquam & ignem in unius panis Substantiam congregatur. Sic variæ gentes, diversæque nationes in unam fidem convenientes, unum de se Christi Corpus efficiunt*, Cæsar. Arel. Hom. 7. de Pasch. in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2. Par. 1610.

(y) *In eadem Homilia.*

It is evident, that *Walafridus Strabo* had this place of *St. Auſtin* in his eye, when having ſaid, (z) *That after the Solemnity of the Old Paſſeover, our Saviour delivered to the ſame Diſciples, the* SACRAMENT *of his Body and Blood in the* SUBSTANCE *of Bread and Wine; and taught them to Celebrate it in remembrance of his moſt Holy Paſſion.* He adds, *That nothing could be found out more proper to ſignifie the Unity between the Head and Members, than theſe* SPECIES. *For as the Bread conſiſting of many Grains, is by Water reduced into one Body, and as the Wine is preſſed out of many Grapes: Thus alſo is the Body of Chriſt made up of the United Multitude of Saints.* Obſerve, that in the words immediately preceding, our

(z) *Poſt* Paſchæ *Veteris ſolemnia, Corporis & Sanguinis ſui* SACRAMENTA *in Panis & Vini* SUBSTANTIA, *eiſdem Diſcipulis tradidit, Nihil ergo Congruentius his* SPECIEBUS, *ad ſignificandam Capitis atque Membrorum unitatem, potuit inveniri. Quia videlicet, ſicut Panis de multis Granis aquæ coagulo in unum corpus redigitur, & Vinum ex multis acinis exprimitur; Sic & Corpus Chriſti ex multitudine ſanctorum coadunata, completur.* de Reb. Eccleſ. cap. 16.

Author

Author ſtiles theſe *Species* the *Subſtance* of Bread and Wine, and in the following words deſcribing the way in which they are made, and thereby adapted to ſignifie the Union between Chriſt and his Members, he calls them ſimply *Bread and Wine*.

The ſame Author (*a*) uſeth the word *Species* for the Fruits of the Earth, and cites for it a forged Decretal Epiſtle under the name of Pope *Eutychian*, which orders all other *Species*, that is, Fruits of the Earth, except what by the Apoſtles conſtitutions may be offered on the Altar to be brought home to the Prieſt to receive Benediction, and the *Species* allowed to be Bleſſed on the Altar are Beans and Grapes.

And *Regino* citing that Canon of the Apoſtles, to which *Walafridus*, or rather the *pretended Eutychian* re-

(*a*) *Unde* Eutychianus XXVIII *Sedis* Romanæ *Præſul conſtituit, fruges ſuper altare tantum Fabæ & Uvæ benedici.* —— *Aliis autem diverſarum* SPECIES *rerum ſtatutum eſt ubilibet benedici a ſacerdotibus*, &c. Ibid. cap. 18. Fruges, & Species *pro Synonymis habuit* Walafridus.

ferreth, gives it this Title, (b) *What Species ought to be offered at the Altar, not for Sacrifice, but for ſimple Benediction*; and the Canon mentions (c) *Ears of new Corn, Grapes, Oyl and Incenſe.* Now in theſe Inſtances none can doubt but by *Species*, the *Specifick Nature*, the Subſtance is to be underſtood, and not the Senſible Qualities of the Particulars mentioned.

In the very ſame ſenſe *Arnobius Junior* (d) uſeth the Term, ſpeaking of God's bounty to the *Iſraelites*, "*Whom* he furniſhed not only with "the *Species* of Corn, but alſo with "thoſe of *Wine* and *Oyl*.

And it appears, that the Unconſecrated Elements were ſtiled *Species*, from a Prayer in the *Gothick* Miſſal, to be uſed after the *Sanctus*, which is

(b) *Quæ* Species *ad altare, non ad Sacrificium, ſed ad Benedictionem ſimplicem debent offerri.* Regino de Diſcip. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 64. ex Can. 4. Apoſt.

(c) —*Præter novas Spicas & Uvas & Oleum & Thymiama, id eſt, incenſum.* — Can. 5. *Reliqua poma omnia ad domum Epiſcopi vel Presbyteri dirigantur*, &c.

(d) *Non ſolum* Speciem frumenti, *ſed &* Vini & Olei *adminiſtrans.* Arnob. in Pſ. 104.

before

before Conſecration. (e) "Moſt "dear Brethren, let us pray that our "Lord and God would Sanctifie by "the Inſpiration of his Heavenly "Grace, this *SPECIES* which "is TO BE Conſecrated, *&c.* Now here *Species* muſt neceſſarily import the *Subſtance*, for our Adverſaries themſelves do not pretend, that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine ceaſe before Conſecration.

But in regard M. *Boileau* will have it, that *Ratram* learn'd this uſe of the word from St. *Ambroſe*, and particularly from his Books *De Sacramentis*, I ſhall crave leave a little more largely to expoſe, the falſhood and indecent confidence of that Aſſertion. That the Inſtance produced by M. *Boileau* is Impertinent, and Miſtaken, I have already ſhewn, and ſhall now make ſome Inſtances to diſprove his pretence intirely.

In the Book *De Initiandis*, which

(e) *Vt Dominus & Deus Noſter SPECIEM iſtam ſuo miniſterio CONSECRANDAM cœleſtis gratiæ inſpiratione ſanctificet.* Miſſale Gothicum, p. 375. *Collectio poſt Sanctus*, in Codd. *Sacramentorum editis per* Thomaſium, Quarto, Romæ, 1680.

more plauſibly pretends to the Authority of St. *Ambroſe*, than the ſix Books of the Sacraments which follow it, we have manifeſt Examples of the uſe of the word *Species*, for the Specifick *Nature*, or *Subſtance*. (*f*) He tells us, That the word *Species is ſometimes uſed to ſignifie the truth*, and not the bare reſemblance; as when it is *ſaid of Chriſt, that he was found in Specie, in faſhion as a Man*; *and of God the Father, neither have ye at any time ſeen his Species*; it's plain, that this Author underſtands by *Species* in the firſt place, Chriſt's *true* Humane Nature, and in the latter the *Divine Subſtance or Eſſence*. (*g*) *For the* Species *of Iron is heavier than the Liquor of Water*. Here *Species ferri* implieth the *ſubſtance* of Iron. And the Author, who ſome Ages after St. *Ambroſe*, enlarged this Tract in-

(*f*) *SPECIEM autem pro VERITATE legimus, & de Chriſto, & Specie inventus ut Homo, & de Patre Deo: Neque Speciem ejus vidiſtis.* Ambr. de iis qui Myſt. initiantur, c. 4.

(*g*) *Gravior eſt enim* ferri Species *quam aquarum liquor*, cap. 9.

to

to ſix Sermons, (*b*) which have long paſſed for ſo many Books of that Father *on the Sacraments*, but plainly appear both by the beginnings and concluſions to be Homilies; I ſay that Author expounds *Species* by *Matter* or *Subſtance*, ſaying of Iron, (*i*) *For it is a more weighty* Subſtance *than the Element of Water.*

Again, (*k*) "Before Conſecrati-"on the Species is named, after Conſecration the Body of Chriſt. (*l*) *Gratian* cites the words thus, *Before Conſecration* another *Species is named*; and the Gloſs (*m*) expounds the word *Species* by *Subſtance*, as the Homiliſt (*n*) doth *by Bread* twice.

(*b*) The fourth of theſe is among St. *Auſtins* Sermons, *de Verbis Dom. Serm.* 28.

(*i*) *Eſt enim* Materies *gravior quam aquarum eſt Elementum, de Sacram.* l. 4. c. 4.

(*k*) *Ante Benedictionem Verborum cœleſtium ſpecies nominatur, poſt Conſecrationem Corpus Chriſti ſignificatur. De initiandis*, c. 9.

(*l*) *De Conſecr.* diſt. 3. c. 69.

(*m*) Alia Species, i. e. *alterius rei Species, id eſt, ſubſtantia fuit.* Gloſſa.

(*n*) *Panis iſte* P A N I S *eſt, ante verba Sacramentorum*, &c. l. 4. c. 4. *Dixi vobis quod ante verba Chriſti, quod offertur* P A N I S *dicatur*, &c. Ibid. l. 5. c. 4.

Alſo

Alſo our *Ambroſiaſter*, in his compariſon between the Supernatural Effect of Baptiſm, and the Miracle wrought by the Prophet *Eliſha*, when he made Iron to ſwim, ſaith, "That "(*o*) before Baptiſm every Man ſinks "like Iron, but when Baptiſed, he "riſeth, like the lighter *Species* of "fruitful Wood. In this place, who doubts but he intended the *Subſtance*, and *not the appearance* of Wood?

In the third Book, he ſaith, The (*p*) Species of the Font is of the form of a Grave, where doubtleſs he meaneth the very *Font-ſtone*, or if not, then its Figure united with the Stone.

Again, He ſtarts an Objection, (*q*) "I ſee not the *Species* of Blood; to "which he anſwers, but what thou "ſeeſt hath a *Reſemblance* of it: For as

(*o*) *Ubi Baptizatus fuerit, non tanquam ferrum, ſed tanquam jam* levior *fructuoſi ligni* Species *levatur.* de Sacram. l. 2. c. 4.

(*p*) *Heſterno die de fonte Baptiſmatis diſputavimus, cujus* Species *veluti quædam Sepulchri forma eſt.* de Sacra. l. 3. c. 1.

(*q*) *Forte dicis* Speciem *Sanguinis non video. Sed habet* ſimilitudinem. *Sicut enim* mortis ſimilitudinem *ſumpſiſti, ita etiam* ſimilitudinem *preciosi ſanguinis bibis.* de Sacra. l. 4. c. 4.

"thou

"thou haſt received the ſimilitude of "his Death, *I preſume he means in Bap-* "*tiſm*, ſo, *thou drinkeſt the ſimilitude* "*of his Blood.* Now the word *Species* being oppoſed to *Similitude*, it is doubtleſs uſed for the *Reality*, not for the *Appearance*. And ſo indeed he Expounds himſelf, objecting the ſame thing in theſe words, (*r*) I ſee only a *Similitude*, I ſee not the *Verity* of Blood.

As I remember, the word Species occurs but once more in theſe Books, and in that (*ſ*) place it unqueſtionably ſignifieth a Figure, or Type; in which ſenſe we find it alſo uſed in the Book (*t*) *De Initiandis*, and by *Ratram* too. But I know not any advantage our Adverſaries can make of this.

Were it neceſſary, I could produce many Inſtances out of St. *Ambroſe*, to prove, that *Species* imports the *Nature*, or *Subſtance*: As when he ſaith of the Pillar, which directed

(*r*) *Quomodo vera Caro, quomodo verus Sanguis? Qui ſimilitudinem video, non video Sanguinis* veritatem. de Sacram. l. 6. c. 1.

(*ſ*) *De Sacram.* l. 2. c. 3.

(*t*) *Cap.* 9.

the

the Marches of the *Iſraelites*,(u) "The "Pillar went before in the *Species* of "a Cloud, but it *Myſtically ſignified* the "Lord Jeſus, *&c.* Who ever doubted it to be a Real Cloud? Again, ſpeaking of the Water turned into Wine by our Saviour, he ſaith, (w) "That "our Lord turned the ſubſtance of "Water into the *Species* of Wine. That is, no doubt, into the *Specifick Nature*, as well as the *ſenſible Appearance* of Wine. But I ſhall trouble you with no more, when I have produced one Inſtance of the uſe of this Term, out of *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, if he really did alleadg the Miracles which we now read in his Work, to prove the Carnal Preſence.

He makes *Plegils*, a *Saxon* Prieſt, to pray that God would diſcover to him, *What the* (x) Species *was which lay*

(u) *Illa autem columna* nubis ſpecie *quidem præcedebat filio* Iſrael, Myſterio *autem* ſignificabat *Dominum Jeſum*, &c. Amb. in Pſal. 118. Oct. 5.

(w) *Ut rogatus ad Nuptias aquæ* Subſtantiam *in Vini* Speciem *commutaret.* Ambr. op. t. 5. Serm. 15. ex Edit. Par. 1632.

(x) *Quæ foret* Species *latitans ſub forma Panis & Vini.* Paſc. Radb. de C. & S. D. c. 14.

bid

hid under the form of Bread and Wine. In which place, according to the *Romaniſts* themſelves, *Species* muſt import the *Natural ſubſtance* of our Lord's Body, and not the ſenſible Qualities only. And I do not remember that *Paſchaſe* (who uſeth the word *Species*, for the ſenſible Qualities of Bread) doth any where intimate its ſubſtance to be deſtroyed. I know in *Berengarius* his time, it was taken for granted that he did. But I am of opinion, that this Notion was a refining upon the Doctrin of *Paſchaſe*, and the firſt Author in which I meet the word *Species*, in the Popiſh ſenſe is *Algerus*, who diſputing againſt *Impanation*, ſaith, (y) "That Chriſt doth not take on him "the Species or Form of Bread in the "Sacrament, as He took the Species "or Form of Fleſh in the Virgin "Womb: For there he took the Spe-"cies or Form together with the Sub-"ſtance, but upon the Altar he aſ-

(y) *Quum in utero ſumpſerit* Speciem *vel formam* cum ſubſtantia: *In altari vero* Speciem *vel formam Panis mutata & non permanente* ſubſtantia. *Alger. de Sacr. l. 1. c. 6.*

"ſumes

"ſumes the *Species* or Form of Bread, "the *ſubſtance not remaining but being* "*changed*. I am confident, the word *Species* was never uſed in the ſenſe of the preſent *Roman* Church before the Eleventh Century, and that not before the Diſputes againſt *Berengarius*, whoſe Adverſaries were the firſt who advanced the Notion now currant.

I have the more largely inſiſted on theſe two Terms, *Veritas* and *Species*, in regard the Confutation of M. *Boileau*'s Expoſition of them, doth effectually Reſcue *Ratram* out of his hands, and evince that there is no colour of Reaſon for him to claim the Authority of this Book, for the ſupport of Tranſubſtantiation. The other Terms remaining in Diſpute, I ſhall diſpatch more briefly; for in Truth, I need only relate M. *Boileau*'s Expoſition of them, to ſatisfie any Impartial Reader who is tollerably skilled in the *Latin* Tongue, that the ſenſe which he gives them, is very unnatural, and abſurd.

I took notice elſewhere, (z) how great Variety of Phraſes are made uſe

(z) Diſſert. *Ch.* IV. p. 73.

of

of in this little Tract to expreſs what we call the *outward Signs* in the Sacrament, and by which we underſtand, as in Baptiſm the *Subſtance of water*, ſo in the H. Euchariſt the *Subſtance of Bread and Wine*. But M. *Boileau* expounds them all of the ſenſible Qualities of the H. Elements without their Subſtance.

1. The Adjective *Viſible* which is ſometimes joyned with Bread, ſometimes with *Species*, ſometimes with *Creature*, *Sacrament*, *Food*, is by our Tranſlatour ſo rendred as though it did ſignifie *Apparent* in oppoſition to *Real*. The *Viſible Subſtance* of Bread, is by him made to imply, ſo much of Bread as appears to the Eye, viz. *Figure* and *Colour*. The *Viſible Creature*, and *Viſible Sacrament*, is with him, no more of them than *falls under our Senſes*, viz. the outward Appearance.

Now if this be the true Senſe of the Word, many paſſages of *Ratram*, and other Authors, are egregious Nonſenſe; for Example. S. *Auguſtin* (*a*) calleth the Manna *Viſible Food*, and in

(*a*) *Citatus à Ratramno. n.* 78, 79.

a few

a few lines after, ſaith, that [in the Sacrament] we now receive *Viſible Food*, which in the next Paragraph he calls the *Viſible Sacrament*. If by the *Viſible* Food or *Sacrament*, we muſt with the Romaniſts underſtand only (*b*)*ſo much as falleth under our ſenſes*, viz. the *ſenſible Qualities*, we muſt then underſtand by the *Viſible* Food which the Fathers eat and underſtood Spiritually, only the *ſenſible Accidents* of the Manna, and believe that more than a million of perſons for forty years together lived upon *roundneſs*, *whiteneſs*, and *ſweetneſs* and other like Accidents of Manna. *Quod credat Judæus Apella.* At this rate of expounding who knows but *Ratram* did with *Baſilides*, and *Saturninus* deny that Chriſt had true Fleſh, a Real Humane Body; for he ſaith it was *viſible* and *palpable*, by which poſſibly he might mean that our Saviour's Body had only the *Qualities* which are proper to affect the *Eye*, or the *Touch*,

(*b*) *La Subſtance Viſible, cèſt a dire, ce qui paroiſt aux yeux de ce pain. n.* 40. *Selonla creature viſible et qui tombe ſous les ſens. n.* 49. *ce que le Sacrament a de viſible. n.* 79. *nourriture viſible & qui tombe ſous les ſens. n.* 78.

without the natural Substance of a true Humane Body. Should that old Hereſie revive, its Proſelytes might as plauſibly wreſt the Terms of this Author to prove that Chriſt had only the *Species* or *external Appearances* of an Humane Body, as M. *Boileau* doth to ſhew, that he believed only the *accidents* of Bread and Wine to remain in the Sacrament after Conſecration.

It is plain that *Bertram* by *Viſible* Bread means *Material* Bread, and by the *Viſible Creature*, he means a *Corporeal* Creature, and by *Viſible Food*, *Bodily Food*. It's very well known, that the (c) Fathers both Greek and Latin commonly diſtinguiſh all beings into *Viſible*, and *Inviſible*, or *Senſible*, which is all one with (d) *Material*, and *Intelligible* or *Spiritual*. And accordingly in the *Nicene* Creed we find all God's

(c) *Græci paſſim* ὁρώμενα, & ἀόρατα, αἰσθητὰ καὶ νοητὰ *opponunt. & per* ὁρώμενα, & αἰσθητὰ *Subſtantias Corporeas intelligunt. Ita & Latini per Viſibilia.*

(d) *Greg. Nyſſen. in Cant. Hom. 6. ſic dividit rerum Naturam & exponit* αἰσθητὸν *per* ὑλῶδες, & νοητὸν *per* ἄυλον. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν αἰσθητὸν καὶ ὑλῶδες, τὸ δὲ νοητὸν καὶ ἄυλον.

Creatures divided into things *Viſible* and *Inviſible*, that is, *Corporeal* and *Incorporeal*, *Bodies* and *Spirits*. So that there is no room to doubt, but *Bertram* uſeth the Word *Viſible* in the Vulgar, and received Senſe, for *Corporeal and Material* Bread.

2. And the ſame doubtleſs he means by that which *the eye beholds, which the bodily ſenſe perceives, that which outwardly appears.* For he ſpeaks in the ſame manner concerning (*e*) the Water in Baptiſm, if you conſider ONLY what the bodily Senſe beholds, it is a *fluid Element*, or *Subſtance*. And again, (*f*) of the Cloud and Red-Sea, they had a *Viſible* form which appeared to the bodily Senſes, which we are to underſtand of the *Subſtance of the Sea and Cloud*, for this latter expreſſion, is in effect the ſame which he had ſaid before, (*g*) that the

---

(*e*) *In eo tamen fonte ſi conſideretur ſolummodo quod* Corporeus aſpicit ſenſus, *elementum fluidum conſpicitur, &c. n.* 17.

(*f*) *Erat namq; eis &* Viſibilis forma *quæ corporis ſenſibus appareret. N.* 21.

(*g*) *Igitur Mare & Nubes non ſecundum hoc quod Corpus extiterant, &c. Ibid.*

Cloud

Cloud and Sea were Bodies, and ſoon after (*b*) of the Manna and Rock Water that they were *Bodily Subſtances*, and that *both the one and the other had a Spiritual Virtue, a Sanctifying Power*, upon which he illuſtrates this Queſtion touching the Euchariſt, by comparing it with thoſe Sacraments of the Old Teſtament.

And the laſt of theſe three Phraſes, *That which outwardly appears, or which appears to the Bodily Senſe*, though it look a little ſuſpiciouſly, yet in Truth, no way favours M. *Boileau*'s Hypotheſis. For even in the Celebrated Catacheſes of *Cyril*, which our Adverſaries produce in Triumph againſt us, φαινόμενος ἄρτος, the Apparent or Viſible Bread ſignifieth *true and real* Bread, the *Subſtance*, and not the meer *appearance* of it, as much as

(*b*) *Similiter Manna*—*& Aqua* -- *Corporales exiiterant*: *& 22. Inerat* Corporeis iſtis Subſtantiis *Spiritualis Verbi poteſtas. Ibid. Verba* Viſibilis, *&* Corporalis. *Rabanus De Inſtit. Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 30. *pro ſynonymis habet.* — *Aqua enim Sacramenti*, Viſibilis *eſt*: *Aqua Spiritus*, inviſibilis *eſt*. —*Sicut etiam Aqua* Corporalis *corpus lavat & potat, ita* Spiritualis *Spiritum abluit & paſcit.*

(i) φαινόμενον μύρον, the *Apparent or Visibile ointment*, signifieth *true* ointment or the *Substance* of the Chrism. And indeed the Phrases above mentioned in *Ratram* designed to express the outward part of the Sacrament, are equivalent to an Expression of *Origen*, (k) who saith, that Holy Eucharist as to the *material part*, is digested and passeth into the draught.

For *Bertram* expresseth himself in the same manner, and makes all the several Phrases which follow, equivalent, viz. (l) *As it is seen*, as it is *Corporally received, pressed by the Teeth*, and passed down the Throat, into the Belly. Now what this *material part* of the H. Eucharist is, *Origen* himself very expresly declares, *viz.*

(i) Τῷ μὲν φαινομένῳ μύρῳ τὸ σῶμα χρίεται. *Catech. Myst.* 3.

(k) Κατὰ αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγενομένην αὐτῷ εὐχὴν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως ὠφέλιμον γίνεται κ. λ. Orig. *in* Matth. *p.* 254. *Edit. Huet.*

(l) *Num secundum hoc quod videtur, quod Corporaliter sumitur, quod dente premitur, quod fauce glutitur, quod receptaculo ventris suscipitur, &c. n.* 52.

(m) the

(*m*) the Material Subſtance of Bread.

3. M. *Boileau* makes the word *Body* to imply only the (*n*) *ſenſible Qualities* and *corporally* to be in a *ſenſible way*. The Expoſition is very harſh yet to juſtifie it, he doth not alledge ſo much as one Inſtance in which theſe are ſo uſed by any Father or other good Author. It were eaſie for me to produce an hundred inſtances of its being taken otherwiſe: but to ſave both my ſelf and the Reader trouble, I will content my ſelf to offer two or three places in this Tract in which it cannot without falſhood and abſurdity be ſo rendred.

N. 15. We ſee there is nothing CORPORALLY changed in them, therefore they muſt needs acknowlege that they are changed in ſome other reſpect than that of the BODY, *&c.*

I preſume none will deny that in this place the Terms *Corporally*, and

---

(*m*) Καὶ, οὐκ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὴν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίο τα αὐτὸν· κλ. *Ibid.*

(*n*) *Corporaliter & Secundum corpus en ce que paroiſt aux ſens corporels. n.* 15. *See the Remarks.*

in *reſpect of the Body* are equivalent, and are oppoſed to *Figuratively*, *in Signification* or *Spiritually*, and ſometimes to *Virtually*, or *in reſpect of its Efficacy*. Now there lies no Antitheſis between an *Appearance* and a *Figure*, or between, *Senſible Qualities* and *Signification*; but there is a manifeſt *Antitheſis* between in *Verity of Nature* and in *Figure*, between the *Subſtance* and *Signification* of the Conſecrated Elements, and ſuch as is authorized by many examples, ſome whereof have been lately produced: whereas I dare challenge M. *Boileau* and all his Brethren of the *Sorbon* to make a ſingle inſtance in St. *Ambroſe*, *Jerome*, *Auguſtin*, *Fulgentius*, or *Iſidore* (which are all the Fathers cited in this Tract) of an Antitheſis between *Appearance*, and *Signification*.

Again, if *corporally changed* be no more than *Senſibly* or *in outward Appearance* changed, then *Ratram*'s Diſcourſe is impertinent upon two accounts. 1. For labouring to confute an Abſurd Doctrin which no Body maintained; for it is not pretended, that *Ratram*'s Adverſaries affirmed that Conſecration made any change in the *ſenſible Appearances* of the Hallowed

lowed *Bread* and *Wine*. And 2*dly*. For proving more than was needful, he mentions all the three kinds of Phyſical Changes, he proves that Conſecration doth not work any of the three, whereas it had been ſufficient for him to have ſhewn that it made no *Alteration*. And indeed by proving, that nothing is *Generated*, or *Corrupted*, he proves effectually that *Bread* and *Wine* remain after Conſecration, which will not conſiſt with the Council of *Trent*.

Beſides, if this were his meaning, that nothing is *Senſibly* changed, when he denieth a *Corporal* Change, it is very wonderful, that he ſhould no where diſtinguiſh between the *Subſtance* of *Bread* and *Wine*, and their *Appearance*, determining the former to be Changed upon Conſecration, and the latter to remain unaltered; but there is nothing like it in the whole Book.

Laſtly, in (*o*) another work our Author ſaith, that God appoints all

(*o*) *De Prædeſt.* lib. 1. p. 42. & *ibidem*, *Univerſa quæ ſive ſecundum corpus, ſive ſecundum animam aguntur*, &c.

things *quæ* ſecundum corpus *homines patiuntur*, *which affect men in their Bodies*; now I ſuppoſe none will be ſo ridiculous as to interpret the words of the Appearance of their Bodies, which plainly import the *Natural Subſtance*.

And even in this place he had juſt before ſaid, that as to the (*p*) *Species of the Creature*——neither the Bread or Wine *have any* thing changed. Which hath been fully proved to imply the *Nature* or *Kind* of thoſe Creatures. Likewiſe in the following context theſe Phraſes *in Truth* or *Reality*, and in their *Proper Eſſence* are uſed in the ſame ſenſe with *Corporally*. And doubtleſs, whatever any thing is according to its *proper Eſſence*, that it is (*q*) in *Propriety of Nature*, or (*r*) *Subſtantially*, both which Terms are uſed by this Author.

In another place (*s*) where he ſaith we muſt not conſider any thing *Corpo-*

(*p*) N. 14. *Secundum Speciem namq; Creaturæ —— panis & vinum nihil habent in ſe permutatum.*

(*q*) In Proprietate *humor corruptibilis*. n. 18.

(*r*) Nam Subſtantialiter *nec Panis Chriſtus* &c.

(*s*) n. 65. 66.

rally

rally in that *Meat* and *Drink* viz. the Conſecrated Elements, he gives this Reaſon, "Becauſe the ſoul cannot "feed on *Corporal Meat* and *Drink*. Now I would fain be informed, whether the *Subſtance of Bread and Wine* be not as unſuitable Food for the ſoul, as the *ſenſible Appearances* thereof, as alſo whether the Soul can feed on the *Natural Fleſh* of *Chriſt*, any more than on *Bread and Wine*? The words are eaſie to be underſtood by any man who hath no intereſt to make the plaineſt things obſcure, and their meaning is, that the Soul which is a Spirit cannot receive Nouriſhment from any *material Food*, which is it ſelf a *Corporeal* Subſtance, and the proper Suſtenance of the Body.

Laſtly, He ſaith elſewhere (*t*) "If "the Wine be CORPORALLY "changed into *Chriſt*'s Blood, then "muſt the Water mixed with it in

(*t*) n. 75. *Si Vinum illud Sanctificatum —— in Chriſti Sanguinem* Corporaliter *convertitur, aqua quoq; quæ pariter admixta eſt, in Sanguinem Populi credentis neceſſe eſt* Corporaliter *convertatur.* —— *At videmus, in aqua* Secundum Corpus *nihil eſſe converſum: conſequenter ergo et in Vino nihil* Corporaliter *oſtenſum.*

"the

"the *Chalice* be CORPORALLY "turned into the Blood of the Faithful——Now we ſee that the Water "hath nothing in it CORPORALLY changed, therefore neither hath the Wine, *&c.*

Will M. *Boileau* ſay, that *Ratram* beleived, the Water to be *Really* and *Subſtantially*, tho not *Senſibly* and in *outward Appearance* turned into the Blood of the People? If *Corporally* doth not ſignifie *Senſibly* but in *Bodily Subſtance*, when he denieth the Water to be *Corporally* changed, then neither doth it ſignifie *Senſibly*, but *Subſtantially* when he denieth the Wine to be ſo changed into the Blood of *Chriſt*.

But M. *Boileau* (*u*) tells us that *Subſtantia*, likewiſe is improperly taken in this Book for the *Appearance*; and to make this out (tho he ſaith the *Calviniſts* confeſs it to be ſometimes uſed Improperly) he hath Muſter'd a great many Examples out of the Fathers; whence we may conclude reaſonably, that he would not have failed to back his new Expoſitions of other Terms, with the like colour-

(*u*) *Remarq.* p. 246. 247. 248.

able

able Authorities, if he could any where have met with them.

But all this ſhew of Authority is meer empty Appearance, for in thoſe few of his Citations, where *Subſtantia* is uſed for the Qualities of any Subſtance, it implyeth them *Subſiſting in their Subject*, and not *of themſelves* their Subject being deſtroyed. Beſides, what tho the word be ſometimes improperly uſed, muſt it therefore never be taken in 'its natural ſenſe? To which add, that as in thoſe Inſtances which he cites, it is apparent that the place will not bear the word in its natural ſenſe; ſo on the contrary thoſe places of this Book in which M. *Boileau* would expound it in an Improper ſenſe, will bear none but the *Natural* and *Primitive* ſenſe of the Word.

N. 54. Where he renders *ſecundum creaturarum Subſtantiam*, The *Viſible Creatures as they appear*, the place neceſſarily determins any unbiaſſed Judgment to underſtand the Word properly, and in the ſenſe of *Ariſtotle*, for which M. *Boileau* frequently declares his Averſion. Had *Bertram* deſigned only to ſay, that the ſame ſenſible Qualities remain, *Quale* and *Tale*

Tale would more aptly have expreſſed his ſenſe, (*w*) than *Quod*, and *Hoc*, which he uſeth. And he would rather have ſaid, they had the Appearance of *Bread* and *Wine* before Conſecration, which they retain after, not Peremptorily that *they were Bread* and *Wine* before, and continue after in the ſame Specifick Nature.

Mr. *Boileau* would not be well pleaſed if we ſhould refuſe to take the word *Subſtance* in its proper ſenſe, in ſome places of this Book, where it is very apparent, that it is improperly uſed. For example. *N.* 30. Where *Ratram* Paraphaſeth on our Saviours Words to his Diſciples, (*x*) *Doth this offend you? What and if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man Aſcend up where he was before?* In this manner. "When after "my Reſurrection ye ſhall ſee me "Aſcend into Heaven carrying with "me my intire Body, and every drop

(*w*) *Nam Secundum creaturarum Subſtantiam, Quod fuerunt ante Conſecrationem Hoc et poſtea CONSISTUNT. PANIS & VINUM prius EXTITERE, in qua etiam SPECIE jam Conſecrata permanere videntur.*]

(*x*) *John* vi. 62, 63.

"of

" of my Blood, (*y*) Then you will " underſtand that my Fleſh is not to " be Eaten by the Faithful in the way " that theſe Infidels imagine, but that " they muſt receive *Bread* and *Wine* " being *in Truth Myſtically* turned *in-* "*to the Subſtance* of my Body & Blood.

Now there are two things which will not permit us to take the Word *Subſtance* properly. 1. The Author ſaith that the things to be Received by the Faithful are (*z*) BREAD and WINE, which appears manifeſtly to any impartial Reader, who obſerveth the Syntax according to M. *Boileau*'s Edition from the *MS.* For the Participle is of the Plural Number and Neuter Gender, which plainly refers to *Bread and Wine*, and not as in the former Editions *Sumendam*, referring to our Saviours Fleſh. This I did not obſerve when I Corrected the Latin Text according to the *Lobez. MS.* and therefore have not altered the Tranſlation. 2. He ſaith it is (*a*) *Myſti-*

(*y*) *Sed Verè* PER *MYSTERIUM*, *PANEM ET VINUM in Corporis & Sanguinis mei converſa* SUBSTANTIAM *a Credentibus Sumenda.* n. 30.

(*z*) *Panem & vinum* —— *ſumenda, non uti in pridem editis Sumendam.*

(*a*) *Vere per Myſterium.*

cally

cally turned into the Subſtance of his Body and Blood, whence we may learn that it is not *properly* changed, it is a Myſtical not a Natural and Subſtantial change, and therefore doth not change the H. Elements from their own Natural Subſtance, into the Proper Subſtance of our Saviours Fleſh and Blood. There may appear ſome Emphaſis in the Adverb *Vere* in Truth, but the Addition of *Per Myſterium* myſtically, clears the Authors meaning, who uſeth the Word to import the Sacramental Verity, not the Natural; For Sacraments give a true Repreſentation, and the *Real Benefits* and *Virtue* of the thing ſignified, tho they do not Exhibit the very *thing it ſelf*. And this ſenſe of the word *True* in Oppoſition to *Falſe*, or *Imaginary* alſo to the *Natural Suſtance* is clearly expreſſed by the Author of the Books (*b*) *de Sacramentis*, who to an Objection which I have mentioned before, I ſee the Similitude, not the Truth of Blood, Anſwers; *Tho thou*

(*b*) *De Sacram.* l. 6. c. 1. In Similitudine quidem accipis Sacramentum, Sed verè Naturæ GRATIAM VIRTUTEMQUE conſequeris. *Suſpicor legendum* veræ; *ſed nil ex conjectura ſtatuo.*

receiv-

receiveſt the Sacrament in a Similitude, yet thou truly obtaineſt the Grace, and Virtue of the Natural Subſtance, which may improperly be ſtiled the *Subſtance* of his Blood. And good Authority I find for this improper uſe of the word *Subſtance* in Sacramental changes in the *Old Gallican Miſſal*, publiſhed firſt at *Rome* by *Thomaſius*, and after at *Paris* by F. *Mabillon*, in which we have this Collect. (c) *Confirm, O Lord, us thy Servants whom thou haſt graciouſly redeemed with water, and the Holy Ghoſt, that putting off the Old Man with his works, we may live after the Converſation of him, into whoſe* SUBSTANCE *thou haſt by theſe Paſchal Myſteries* TRANSLATED *us* &c. This Prayer was made in the name of the New Baptized Perſons on the *Friday* in *Eaſter* week. And you may obſerve that it ſpeaks of thoſe Neophytes as *turned into the Subſtance of Chriſt*, by the Sacraments of Baptiſm and the

(c) *Confirma, Domine, famulos tuos quos ex Aqua & Spiritu ſancto propitius redemiſti, ut veterem hominem cum ſuis actionibus deponentes, in ipſius converſatione vivamus, ad cujus* SUBSTANTIAM *per hæc Paſchalia Myſteria* TRANSTULISTI. *Per. Miſſ. Gallic. Miſſ. Paſchal. Fer.* vi.

Lords

Lords Supper received immediately upon it. Which cannot be underſtood of the Natural Subſtance of his Fleſh, but of his Myſtical Body into which they were Incorporated by the Sacrament of Baptiſm, and made *true* Members of Chriſt, not in *Verity of Nature*, but in *Veritate Myſterii velSacramenti*, deriving true Grace and Spiritual ſtrength from Chriſt their Head.

I ſhall but in a word ſhew how vainly he baulks the Adverb *Figurement*, *Figuratively* in Tranſlating *Figurate*, and conſtantly renders it *in a Figure*, which I ſhould not have noted, but that there is a manifeſt deſign to Inſinuate, that the Accidents are the outward Sign and Figure under which not Bread and Wine, but the Natural Subſtance of Chriſts Body and Blood do exiſt. And *F. Mabillon* (*d*) imputes it a great Crime to the Hugonot Tranſlatour, that he hath ren-

(*d*) A.B. Sec. iv. p. 2. n. 116. *Uno in verſu duo ſunt* facinora, *Primum quod* Sub Figura *vertit* Figurement, *uti etiam* pag. 2. *non enim ait Auctor hæc Myſteria* in Figura *celebrari, ſed* Sub Figura *quæ Corpus Chriſti velet, non excludat.*

dred

dred *Sub Figura* Figuratively; whereas to any Man who will conſult this Author throughout, it will ſoon appear that the good Father departed from his uſual Candour, in paſſing that ſevere Cenſure on his Countryman. For *Ratram* doth indifferently uſe the following Phraſes, *viz.* (*e*) *Under* a Figure, *in* a Figure, *by* a Figure, *Figuratively*, and it is *a Figure*, affirming in all theſe various ways of Expreſſion, that the Holy Euchariſt is Chriſts Body, as may be ſeen, by the Inſtances in the Margin, and indeed the words *in a Figure*, do not imply the Holy Euchariſt to conſiſt of the *Perſon* of our Saviour *under the Accidents* of Bread and Wine, which our Adverſaries call the Figure, or Vail: For St. *Auſtin* (*f*) ci-

(*e*) *Myſteria Corporis & Sanguinis* Sub Figura *dicit celebrari*, n. 34. *Verba autem St.* Auguſtini *ita ſe habent.* Figura *ergo* eſt, n. 33. *quibus contraria eſſe affirmat* Ratramnus *placita eorum qui docent non* in Figura, n. 32. *Aliud exterius* per *Figuram oſtendens*, n. 92. Figurate *Chriſti Corpus & Sanguis exiſtunt*, n. 10. *Secundum quendam modum Corpus Chriſti eſſe cognoſcitur, & modus iſte* in Figura *eſt*, n. 84.

(*f*) *Petra Chriſtus* in Signo, Verus Chriſtus *in Verbo & in Carne*, n. 78. i. e. *Signum Chriſti, non Verus Chriſtus.*

ted by *Ratram*, ſaith, That the Rock was Chriſt *in Signo*, which imports not, that it was Chriſt perſonally preſent under the *Appearance* of a Rock, but that the Rock was a Sign or Type of Chriſt. So in his Expoſition of the LIV (*g*) Pſalm, he ſaith, *David* was Chriſt *in a Figure*, that is, a *Figure of Chriſt*, or *Figurately* ſtiled the Chriſt, or Anointed of *God*.

2. He likewiſe amuſeth us, as though there were ſome ſpecial Myſtery in thoſe Verbs, which according to the Tumid Stile of the Middle Ages, *Ratram* uſeth inſtead of the Verb Subſtantive *Eſt*. And therefore he renders (*h*) *Cognoſcitur*, is ſenſibly *known*. *Cernitur* and *Videtur*, appears to our Bodily ſenſe; in the like manner *Oſtenditur* and *Monſtratur*: Now if there were any Emphaſis intended in the uſe of theſe words, as perhaps ſometimes there was, though not generally, yet the Emphaſis is directly contrary to what M. *Boileau*

(*g*) David *in Figura Chriſtus eſt*, Tom. 8. in Pſ. 54.

(*h*) N. 12. *Et alibi paſſim.*

makes

makes it; for the Author doth not uſe thoſe Terms by way of Reſerve and Caution, or to expreſs an uncertainty, as this Tranſlator very ridiculouſly makes him rendring *Videntur*, it ſeems, *N.* 54. For where there is an Emphaſis, they do vehemently affirm or deny, and imply the higheſt aſſurance of the Truth of what is ſaid; the Evidence of Senſe, and certain Knowledge, being the beſt grounds upon which we can conclude a thing either to be, or not to be. So that in the place newly mentioned, *Ratram* doth expreſly ſay, That we ſee the Conſecrated Bread and Wine remain in the former *Species*, or Kind, and not as our *(i)* Tranſlator hath it; *it ſeems they* remain after Conſecration in the *ſame Appearance*. And he uſeth promiſcuouſly *Videtur*, *Oſtenditur*, and *Cernitur*, which laſt is not capable of that doubtful ſenſe, which the firſt may ſometimes bear.

However, I ſay commonly theſe

(*i*) *Et depuis* il ſemble *qu'elles demeurent dans la meme eſpece, c'eſt a dire apparences.* Remarque p. 250.

Verbs are not Emphatical, but uſed for the Verb Subſtantive, as in the following Inſtances. (*k*) *There is no ſmall difference* [known to be] *among them.* Again, How can that be called Chriſt's Body, in which no change is [known to be] made. And the ſame Occurs at leaſt four times over in the ſame and the next Paragraph, and is expounded by the Author himſelf, ſaying expreſly, (*l*) that there IS nothing changed, and that the Bread and Wine HAVE NOTHING changed in them. Again, (*m*) could either the Sea, as it was [ſeen to be] an Element, have a Baptiſmal vertue, or the Cloud as it *did ſhew* condenſed Air, ſanctifie

(*k*) *Non parva diverſitas inter vos eſſe* dinoſcitur, n. 2. *In quo nulla permutatio facta eſſe* cognoſcitur, n. 12. *Non iſte tranſitus factus eſſe* cognoſcitur, ibid.

(*l*) *Si ergo nihil hic* EST *permutatum*, &c. n. 13. *Nihil* HABENT *in ſe permutatum*, n. 14.

(*m*) *Num mare ſecundum quod Elementum* VIDEBATUR, i. e. *fuit, Baptiſmi potuit habere virtutem? Vel Nubes juxta quod denſioris craſſitudinem aeris* OSTENDEBAT, i. e. *aer craſſus & condenſatus fuit*, n. 20.

the

the People. Did the Sea only ſeem to be Water, or had the Cloud only an Appearance of condenſed Air, or were they in ſubſtance, the one Water, and the other thick Air? I muſt needs ſay, M. *Boileau* plays at ſmall Games, when he lays ſo much ſtreſs on nothing, and hath the confidence, becauſe *Ratram* ſaith, That the Body and Blood of Chriſt celebrated in the Church, are different from that Body and Blood which now is [known to be] Glorified, to aver that (*n*) all the Difference that *Ratram* makes between Chriſt's Body in Heaven, and on the Altar, is, that [both being his Glorified Body] the former *Glorificatum Cognoſcitur*, is known to be Glorified, whereas he might as eaſily have ſaid ſimply, IS Glorified. Now if by *Cognoſcitur*, M. *Boileau* means, is *ſenſibly* Glorified, as I preſume he doth, Chriſt's Body in Heaven to us, ap-

(*n*) *Toute la difference qu'il y etablit entre le Corps de J. C. dans la gloire eſt que ce dernier* per reſurrectionem jam glorificatum *cognoſcitur, a lieu qu'il n'avoit qu' a dire* jam glorificatum *exiſtit, qui eſt un mot en uſage*, &c. Pref. p. 40.

peareth not Glorious, being received up out of our ſight.

He likewiſe mightily vapours with the word (o) *Exiſtit*, as though it imported the Exiſtence of Chriſt's Natural Body in the Sacrament, and ten times over twits us with theſe words, *The Bread and Cup is called the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and IS SO.*

Now all this Flouriſh hath nothing in it. For firſt, Our Author (p) uſeth the word *Exiſtit*, for *Eſt*, in forty places of this Book, of which ſee two or three Examples in the Margin, 2. Where he uſeth the word *Exiſtit*, he generally addeth ſomething that is Inconſiſtent with their Notion of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sa-

(o) P. 40. Pref. p. 224. Rem. &c. *Iſte Panis & Calix qui Corpus & Sanguis Chriſti nominatur & EXISTIT*, n. 99.

(p) N. 21. *Baptiſmum tamen* extitiſſe *pro fuiſſe*, n. 26. *Angelorum cibus exiſtit*, n. 40. *Mortis & Paſſionis —— cujus exiſtunt* repræſentationes.

cra-

crament: (q) Telling us, either that the Bread and Cup are his Spiritual Body and Blood, or they are the SACRAMENT of his Body and Blood. That in *ſome reſpect*, [not ſimply,] they are truly his Body and Blood; and elſewhere intimates that they are not his *proper Body*, but only a *Figure*, or *Myſtery* thereof; and expreſly ſaith, near the beginning of this Tract, that it is clear, that the Holy Bread and Wine, are FIGURATIVELY the Body and Blood of Chriſt; by which Expoſition of the Author himſelf, we are ſatisfied how we muſt underſtand that Paſſage, M. *Boileau* ſo much Triumphs in. But what moſt amazeth me, is to find, that in his Remarks on *N.* 16. and theſe words whence it neceſſarily

(q) Spirituale *Corpus*, Spiritualiſque *Sanguis* exiſtit, n. 16. *Exiſtunt repræſentationes— ejus ſumunt appellationem cujus* exiſtunt Sacramentum, n. 40. Secundum quid, n. 83. *id eſt*, Secundum quendam modum *nimirum Figurate, quemadmodum clarius rem exponit* Ratramnus, n. 84. *Item de Corpore ex Virgine*, Proprium *ſalvatoris Corpus* exiſtit, *de Myſtico, Corpus quod* per Myſterium exiſtit, n. 97. & 96. *Claret quia Panis ille Vinumque* Figurate *Chriſti Corpus & Sanguis* exiſtunt.

followeth, that the change is made *Figuratively*, he makes a Flouriſh with Authorities, and makes a Parallel between *Ratram*, *Paſchaſe*, and the ſecond *Nicene* Council, (r) making them all teach the ſame Doctrin, whereas our Author ſaith, That the Holy Elements, are *Figuratively* the Body and Blood of Chriſt, or the Spiritual Body and Blood, which is all one; and the *Nicene* Doctors ſay, that they are Κυρίως, properly his Body and Blood. I would gladly be informed, in what *Greek* Lexicon Mr. *Boileau* finds that word expounded by *Figurate*.

But thirdly, Thoſe words of *Ratram* overthrow the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, and by very firm (ſ) conſequence infer, that the *Bread and Wine do remain after Conſecration*. For by the Rules of Logick, this Argument is good, M. *Boileau* is

(r) *Rem.* p. 225. Μετὰ γὰρ τὰ ἁγιασμὸν σῶμα ΚΥΡΙΟΥ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ λέγονται καὶ εἶναι, καὶ πιστεύονται.

(ſ) *Ab eſt vel exiſtit adjecti vertii, ad eſt adjecti ſecundi valet conſequentia; Panis Corpus Chriſti exiſtit, ergo Panis exiſtit.*

Dean

Dean of *Sens*, therefore M. *Boileau* IS in being; and in like manner *after Conſecration*, Bread and Wine *are* the Body and Blood of Chriſt: Therefore after Conſecration, Bread and Wine *do exiſt*.

Thus at length, I have done with his Expoſition of our Author's controverted Terms, which if true, Mr. Dean would do well to Publiſh a Gloſſary on purpoſe to aſſiſt the Reader, who by the help of all the Dictionaries yet extant, will never be able to comprehend this Author's ſenſe. But I muſt needs ſay, the difficulties are all Fictions of the Tranſlator, who delights to perplex the moſt plain Expreſſions, and by new and bold Figures, and forced Significations invented to ſerve his deſign, hath offered manifeſt violence to our Author's words, in an hundred Paſſages of this ſmall Piece. I confeſs he uſeth ſo great Licenſe, and indulgeth his Fancy at ſo extravagant a Rate, that I was almoſt tempted to think, that M. *Boileau* the Poet, had commenced Doctor in the *Sorbon*, and began unluckily to play the Divine, as Poets commonly do, when they begin their Theological Studies in their

their Old Age. If it had really been ſo, I could have pitied and forgiven him many Extravagancies, which are venial Faults in a Poet, but unpardonable in a Profeſſor of Divinity.

Here I once thought to diſmiſs him, but upon ſecond Thoughts, I reſolved to attend him a little further, and conſider the Reflections wherewith he concludeth his Preface: I ſhall ſay nothing in defence of Proteſtant Tranſlators three Reflections, which ſtand firm after all his weak aſſaults upon them.

His firſt Reflection is, That ſuppoſing, though falſly, that *Ratram* intended to diſpute againſt the *Real Preſence*, yet ſince he treats his Adverſaries as *Catholicks*, and calleth them the *Faithful*; the Queſtion in diſpute muſt neceſſarily have been ſome opinion of leſs moment than the *Real Preſence*; the belief thereof, or of the contrary, could never have been held indifferent by the Faithful.

Not to ſpend time in expoſing his abſurd pretence to ſuppoſe a thing, when he immediately aſſumes, and concludeth the contrary, I deny this conſequence, *viz.* *Ratram* doth not call

call his Adverſaries Hereticks, but treats them as Brethren, therefore he did not write againſt the Real Preſence. All that can be concluded thence, is, that the Adverſaries of that Doctrin were then as they ſtill are, Perſons of a more charitable and meek Spirit, than thoſe who maintain and propagate it. There is a great deal of difference between Hereſie, and ſome groſs Errors, whoſe Patrons do not deſert the Communion of the Church; and therefore it doth not follow, that becauſe *Ratram* treats theſe *Erring Brethren* as Catholicks, and includes them with their Adverſaries in the common Notion of *Faithful*, he muſt needs eſteem the Queſtion in diſpute of ſo little moment, that it was indifferent which way it was held. It's plain, he (*a*) chargeth them with Conſequences very abſurd, (*b*) with contradicting themſelves, with ſubverting what they pretended to believe; (*c*) and

(*a*) Num. 11.
(*b*) Num. 15.
(*c*) Num. 32. *Sanctorum Scriptis Patrum contraire comprobantur.*

with

with contradicting the Authority of the Fathers, which are no very ſlight Accuſations, and ſhew plainly, that he did not eſteem it a matter of no moment, whether his own or his Adverſaries Opinion were embraced.

His ſecond Reflection is, That *Ratram* could not poſſibly write againſt *Paſchaſe*, becauſe he takes no notice of the Miracle of Chriſt's Apparition in the form of Fleſh, alledged by *Paſchaſe* in the fourteenth Chapter of his Book.

To which I Anſwer, 1. That there is no neceſſity that he ſhould take notice of this Miracle any more than he doth of his other Arguments, ſince, as it hath been before obſerved, that it is the Notion and not the Book of *Paſchaſe*, againſt which he diſputeth. He acts the part of an Opponent throughout, and never anſwers one Argument, ſave that he once, *N.* 56. obviates an Objection from St. *Ambroſe*.

2. That admitting us to pretend, that *Ratram* encountered the Book of *Paſchaſe*, we may as fairly from our Author's Silence infer, that there were no ſuch Miracles alledged in it, but that thoſe Fables were ſince foiſted in.

M. *Boi-*

M. *Boileau* ſaith, that *Blondel* rejects the whole Chapter as ſpurious; I have not his Book at command to ſee his Reaſons, but I cannot believe he did it without all Authority, as is pretended. M. *Boileau* (*d*) himſelf ſaith enough to ſhew, that the two laſt Miracles were foiſted in, when he acquaints us, that one Old Manuſcript hath *all Three*, but another more Antient, *only One*. If one Superſtitious Monk took liberty to Inſert thoſe two, why might not the firſt (which doubtleſs was the Fiction of ſome *Greek* Monk after the Second *Nicene Synod*) together with the Diſcourſe that uſhers it in, be a Forgery too?

As for the Story of *Gregory* the Great, and the *Roman* Matron (which is likewiſe foiſted into our *Saxon* Homily) out of the Life of that Pope, it was impoſſible that *Paſchaſe* ſhould alledge it. Since that Life of *Gregory* was not written in many years after (*e*) *Paſchaſe* had Publiſhed his Book, and admitting him to have Lived till 865. which is fourteen Years after

(*d*) Pref. p. 52.
(*e*) According to F. *Maubillon*, A. D. 831.

the

the time when *Sirmondus* ſaith he Died; *Paſchaſe* muſt have been at leaſt ſeven Year in his Grave, before (*f*) *Joannes Diaconus* wrote the Life of *Gregory*, (in which only it occurs) and Dedicated it to Pope *John* the VIII, who was Advanced to the Papal Throne, *A. D.* 872. that is, about forty Years after *Paſchaſe* firſt Publiſhed his Book, and above twenty after his (*g*) Reſignation of the Abby, and conſequently after his ſecond Publication of it, with an Epiſtle to *Carolus Calvus*, in which he ſtileth himſelf Abbot.

As for the ſtory of *Plegils* the *Saxon Presbyter*, who prayed to ſee Chriſt in the form of a Child, and obtained his Requeſt; it is a ſhrew'd Preſumption againſt the Antiquity, and Authority thereof, that it is omitted by the Interpolator of the *Saxon* Homily, who would hardly have neglected ſo remarkable a Miracle wrought in Favour of an Engliſh Prieſt.

But Thirdly, not to ſtand expoſing

(*f*) *Vide Voſſium de Hiſt. Latin.* l. 2. c. 36. *de* Joanne Diacono.

(*g*) *A. D.* 851.

the

the Falſhood and Impudence of theſe fained Apparitions, or rather of their Fabulous Author, (*h*) they all prove too much, or elſe juſt nothing. For either in theſe Apparitions they ſaw *what really was* under the forms of Bread and Wine, and *what really was* Tranſacted in the Sacrament, or they did not. If they did not, the whole was a meer Illuſion and Fancy. And on the other hand if they did, Then Chriſt according to the deſcription of the firſt, and third Miracle is *ſtill an Infant*, both the *Jew* and the *Saxon* Prieſt are ſaid to have ſeen a little Child. Again, Chriſt muſt be divided into ſeveral parts, as the *Jew* ſaw his Body broken in Pieces in St. *Baſil*'s Hands. Again, every Communicant doth not Receive Chriſt Intire, but only ſome part of him, for the Roman Matron ſaw the Piece which ſhe was to receive, turned (*i*) into a Joint of

(*h*) *Joannes Diaconus* lived neer 300 years after. *Gregory's Pontificate*, is a Fabulous Writer and Author of the ſtory of *Trajans* Soul being Praid out of Hell by that *Pope*.

(*i*) him bam ꝑeaꝛ ð æꝛeoꝑeð ſeo ſnæð ðæſ huſleſ ðe heo ðicgan ſceolðe ſꝑyl-ce ðaꝛ læg on ðam ðiſce aneſ ꝑingꝛeſ liþ æal geblodgoð. *Hom. Sax.* Fol. 38.

the

the little Finger all Bloody. Again, at this rate Christ must be actually slain, and the Sacrifice of the Altar be a Bloody Sacrifice, for the *Jew* is said to see his Body divided in S. *Basils* hands, and our *Saxon* Miracle Monger tells us that the two Monks, *saw an Angel with a Sword at Consecration divide the Childs Body*, and *pour his Blood into the Chalice*, and if so what becomes of the Doctrin of Concomitancy? So that either these Miracles prove nothing at all, or else they prove what will as little consist with the Romish Belief as with ours.

His Third Reflection is this, That if *Ratram* had been against the Real Presence, he would not have failed to have Reproached the *Greeks* with the Belief of it, in his four Books Written against them,

But this is a very Trifling Remark, for this was a point upon which the *Greek* as well as the *Latin* Church was at that time divided, and as it had been unreasonable to Reproach the whole Church with the Errors of one Party, so it had been Imprudently done to object to the *Greek* a Reproach which might have been retorted on the Latin Church.

But

But the true reaſon of his Silence on that Queſtion is, that he had no occaſion to mention it, ſince it was none of the Ten Points which F. *Mabillon* ſaith, were matter of diſpute between the two Churches, and the Subject of *Ratram*'s Book; (*k*) what they were you may ſee in the Margin.

As for what he ſaith touching the Adoration of the Euchariſt, it is not my Province to conſider it, tho I ſee nothing but what hath been long ſince objected by their Writers, and often Anſwered by ours; but my Appendix being already grown to more than double the Bulk firſt deſigned, I ſhall deſire the Reader to conſult our Au-

(*k*) *Capitula iſta numero erant omnino decem, nempe de Proceſſione Spiritus Sancti ex patre Filioq; de jejunio Sabbati, de Coelibatu Presbyterorum, de Chriſmatione Frontis Baptizatorum Presbyteris vetita, de Abſtinentia octo hebdomadarum ante Paſcha non inchoata, de Barbæ ratione Clericorum, de Epiſcoporum Ordinatione per ſaltum, de Primatu Romani Pontificis, de Confectione Chriſmatis ex aqua fluminis, & de Oblatione agni in Feſto Paſchæ.* A. B. Sec. 4. p. 2. *Præf.* n. 160.

thors who handled that Question at large, and particularly the Answer (*l*) published about two years since, to M. *Boileau*'s Book on that Subject which he mentions twice or thrice in the *Preface*.

And at parting give me leave to offer one Reflection which any man, though of no very profound Reach must naturally make upon M. *Boileau*'s design and methods in this Edition of *Rutrum*.

As there is nothing the Church of *Rome* boasts more of than a sure Rule of Faith, an Infallible Judge in Controversies, and their great Unity and agreement in Doctrin, so our late Deserters pretend, that our Dissentions which can never be Composed for want of a Supreme Tribunal in our Church, and our Uncertainty in matters of Faith, and want of any certain Rule for the direction either of our Belief or Conscience was the Cause why they left our Communion for one in which they pretend there are none of these defects, and private

(*l*) A Discourse of the Adoration of the H. Eucharist. quarto London, 1686.

Spirits, no such liberty of Interpreting the H. Scriptures as among us.

Now who ever Reads M. *Bailey's* Preface must needs see, that there is nothing like that Unity which Mr. *Sclater* (*m*) Celebrates in such Raptures of Joy, as would make a man imagine, that he had been upon his Conversion taken up into the third Heaven, and in an excess of Charity when he came down again, would have given all he was worth to find in one single Family in *England*, I presume he means his own, where the Father is divided against the Son, and the Son against the Father &c. according to the Letter of our Saviours Prediction. But I leave him in his New Atlantis to entertain himself at this juncture with his Chimerique (*n*) Speculation of *France* under the Spiritual Tuition of 17 Arch-bishops, 197 Bishops, &c. *Italy* under one Supreme Bishop, Head of Unity, Conservator of Peace and Truth &c. and return to consider the wonderful Agreement of the Catholick Doctors.

(*m*) *Consens. Vet.* p. 11.
(*n*) *Consens. Vet.* p. 11.

This ſmall Tract for ſixſcore year, together is forbidden, Condemned for Heretical by the general Vote of moſt of their Great Divines, Popes, Cardinals and others; I may add the Council of *Trent* too, which had as great an Intereſt in that Index wherein *Bertram* ſtands Condemned, as it had in the Catechiſm. Now all on a ſudden he is acknowledged for a good Catholick. But tho he be ſo in *France*, I doubt in *Spain* and *Italy*, his Doctrin, were he alive to Anſwer for it, would bring him in danger of the Inquiſition. Nay tho this Tract be pronounced Orthodox at *Paris* by M. *Boileau* and his Brethren, yet at *Lyons* it is Rejected as Spurious, or at leaſt Adulterated with Heretical mixture, ſuch Bleſſed Agreement is there among their Doctors of this and the laſt Age, and of thoſe of *France*, with their Brethren in *Italy* and *Spain*; nay in *France* it ſelf between M. *de Marca* A. B. of one Metropolitical Church, who ſaith, it was written by *Jo. Scotus*, and condemned in the Councils of *Rome* and *Vercellis*, and M. *Dean* of

(o) *See.*

another

another Metropolitical Church, who ſaith it is Catholick, and written for the real Preſence.

Perhaps it may be ſaid, that this is matter of *Fact* to which the Infallibility doth not extend, but not of *Faith*; But by their leave, I look upon it a matter of *Faith*, and what neerly concerns mens Conſciences, eſpecially in an Age of Converſions. For the Queſtion is not whether the Book be Genuin or Spurious, but whether the Doctrin which it contains be *Orthodox* or *Heretical*. Suppoſe a wavering Catholick ſhould come to M. *Boileau*, and propoſe his doubts concerning the *Trent* Doctrin having been ſhocked in his belief thereof, by that paſſage of S. *Auſtine*, which made *Frudegard* doubt the Truth of *Paſchaſe* his Doctrin, and make Confeſſion of his *Faith* in the words of *Bertram*, "Set your "Heart at reſt, your Belief is very "ſound, you are a good Catholick, "would M. *Boileau* ſay. But then becauſe this is but one Doctors Opinion, ſhould he Conſult M. *Pariu* who ſupported *De Marca's* conjecture, he would tell him this is down right *Hereſie*, condemned in ſeveral Councils, and every body knoweth the Importance

of that Sin, and that such a Declaration must needs disturb the Conscience, which was set at ease by M. *Boileau's* more favourable Sentence. Such certain direction have men in the Roman Communion for their Faith and Consciences over what we have! I am of opinion, few of their doubting Catholicks, or New Converts are able to declare their *Faith* touching the Sacrament so intelligibly and distinctly, as *Ratram* hath delivered his Judgment in this Book, and I fear few of their Spiritual Guides understand what is the Doctrin of their Church better than those Doctors who have Condemned *Ratram* for an Heretick.

And withal, Where is the Obedience of private Spirits, and their deference to Church Authority, when three or four *Sorbon* Doctors confront three Popes, five Cardinals, besides Archbishops, and Bishops, with other Doctors, almost numberless? Methinks it looks like an Argument that private Spirits in that Communion, are as Wanton and Ungovernable, as among the Protestants. And methinks, Mr. *Sclater* seems to resolve his own Conversion into the Dictates of the private Spirit, and

that

that whatever opinion he might have of those Divines, who carried Church Authority highest, yet he had little Reverence for it himself, otherwise he would have listened to the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies, which are the publick Doctrin of our Church, rather than the moderate Declarations of Bishop *Forbes*, Bishop *Andrews*, and Bishop *Taylor*, that is one single Bishop in each of those three Kingdoms, who notwithstanding believed Transubstantiation no more than we now do.

And though he reproach our private Spirits with sensing the five little Words of our Saviour, any Man that ever looked into Controversie, can tell him, that the private Spirits of his Church have with a much more extravagant Wantonness, sensed those Words contradicting one another almost in the sense of every Word; and whilst they condemn us for admitting one Figure, Authorised by Scripture Examples, and the Authority of the Fathers, in which we all agree, they are forced without any such Authority to admit several, Quarrelling with one another about the sense of almost every Word. See

Albertin. de Euchar. lib. 1. *c.* 9, 10, 11. Biſhop *Morton*, of the Euchariſt, Book the Second, Edition 1635. If this be the Unity which Mr. *Sclater* ſo much Applauds, let him enjoy it without our Envy.

As for M. *Boileau*'s part, he hath ſenſed this Author at ſuch a rate, that uſing the ſame Liberty, a Man might make a *Calviniſt* of *Paſchaſius*, a *Roman Catholick* of *Barengarius*, an *Arian* of *Athanaſius*: And ſince Maſter *Sclater* (*f*) offers the Hint, by telling of a thoughtful Gentleman, no doubt, who held it worth while to enquire, whether the *Alcoran* might not have its motives of Credibility; I ſhall add, that upon the ſame Priviledge of perverting the natural ſenſe of Words, which M. *Boileau* makes uſe of, he might Reconcile *Mahomet* with Chriſt, and make Goſpel of the *Alcoran*.

(*f*) *Conſenſus Veterum*, p. 2.

FINIS.

An Account of the ſeveral Editions of Bertram.

1. AT *Cologne*, A. D. 1532. in *Octavo*. Father *Colbet* ſaith, That this was Printed at *Baſil*, not *Cologne*; but I know not why we may not believe it to have been Printed at *Cologne*, in regard *Hermannus* was then Archbiſhop, who favoured the Reformation; and though he did not at that time publickly declare, yet he might ſecretly encourge it.

2. At *Geneva*, A. D. 1541. in *Octavo*. Wherein the Publiſher hath taken upon him to correct the Author's *Latin*, as to put *Servator* for *Salvator*, &c. For which reaſon I have corrected nothing in *Bertram*'s Text by the Authority of this Edition, nor noted his Variations.

3. In the *Micropresbyticon*, Printed at *Baſil*, 1550. *Fol.* we find *Bertram*, *p.* 513.

4. A

4. A Second Edition at *Cologne*, with *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, whom the Publiſher miſtook for *Rabanus Maurus*, and ſome other Pieces on that Argument, *Octavo*, A. D. 1551.

5. At the end of a *Dialogiſticon* (which is ſaid to be written by Biſhop *Poinet*) Printed at *Geneva*, 1557. is *Bertram*'s Book, Printed after the former Edition, at *Geneva*.

6. *Feugereus*, a *Frenchman*, and Profeſſor of Divinity at *Leiden*, Publiſhed it with his *Opuſcula*, in *Octavo*, *Lugd. Bat.* 1579.

7. In the *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*, printed at *Geneva*, 1608. in *Folio*, it is inſerted, after the *Cologne* Impreſſion, *Lib.* 10.

8. *Lindanus* hath Publiſhed this Book with Notes, which I have not ſeen, but have my Information from the Catalogue of Books, Prohibited newly by the *French* Clergy.

9. There are two Editions in *French* and *Latin*, the latter in the Year 1672. The *Latin* Text of this Edition, being moſt accurate, is that which I followed, in the firſt Edition, ſave in manifeſt falſe Prints, or where F. *Mabillon*'s M. S. hath directed a better Reading.

10. Dr.

10. Dr. *Bollean*, Dean of *Sens*, hath Published one Author in *French* and *Latin*, from F. *Mabillon's* Copy, *Octavo*, *Paris* 1686.

11. In *English*, it was Printed A. D. 1549. which Translation was made either by Bishop *Ridley*, or his Advice, and is accurate enough, but the Language obsolete.

12. In *Scotland*, it was Printed at *Aberdeen*, A. D. 1622. in *Octavo*.

13. A. D. 1623. Sir *Humphrey Lynd* Published the Translation newly Reprinted.

Casaubon told Archbishop *Usher*, that he saw a Manuscript of it in possession of Mr. *Gillot*, a Senator of *Paris*. Perhaps it was the same which I find in *Thuanus* his Library; which F. *Mabillon* saith, is not a true Copy.

That Father however acknowledges, that there is an excellent Old Manuscript of it in the *Lobe's* Library in the *Low-Countries*, upon the *Sambre*, in the Diocess of *Cambray*, and that he found another M. S. in a Cistercian Monastery in *Germany*, called *Sulem Writer*, written above 700. years since.

All

All the Printed Editions I have seen and compared, except the first *Cologne*, that of *Lomitrus*, and the *Scotch* Impression, and have noted all material Variations, except false Prints, and the arbitrary Variations of the *Geneva* Copy, but have followed the Text of D. *Boileau*, who tells us that he hath Printed after an accurate Copy of the *Lobe*'s M.S. and I have distinguished the Text into Sections or Paragraphs, according to his Partition, that the Reader may without trouble, find our References to the Text of the Author, in either his Edition or mine.

11 JU 62

ERRATA.

In the Preface.

PAge 2. Margin, Line 2. Read *Octavo*. p. 9. l. 21. r. *as invient as*, p. 18. marg. l. 12. r. *ubi*, p. 30. marg. l. 2. r. *Rawanol*, p. 32. mar. l. 17. r. *humanæ jure*, p. 79. mar. l. 6. r. *vestra*, l. 7. r. *Prostratis*, p. 109. l. 24. r. *unlikely*.

In the Book.

Page 133. l. 13. dele *the Body*, p. 134. mar. l. 4. dele *non*, p. 136. l. 9. r. *aspiciat*, p. 138. l. 14. r. *ut pote cum*, p. 142. l. 15. r. *monstrasur*, l. 24. *secundum*, p. 144. l. 15. r. *consideretur*, l. 21. *ex non esse*, p. 146. l. 4. r. *quod non fuit*, p. 156. l. r. *patres*, p. 160. l. 14. r. *atque potat*, p. 164. l. 13. r. *hoc non corpore*, p. 165. mar. add *Ps.* 78. 25. p. 169. l. 6. r. *Corporis* l. 18. *propinquante*, marg. r. *Resurrexit*, it. *alius*, p. 180. l. 12. r. *pro Paulus lege Apostolus*, mar. l. 1. r. *Hæc*, p. 186. l. 20. dele *planissime*, p. 188. mar. l. 3. r. *Dispensationem*, p. 194. mar. (*a*) r. *in Impressis Domini*, (*b*) Ibid. cap. 9. (*c*) *Quod in editis*, p. 218. l. 2. r. *qui*, p. 226. l. 21. dele *Paulum*, p. 228. l. 13. r. *sequente eos petra*, p. 229. mar. r. *Joh.* 6. 50. p. 244. l. 18. r. *habuere futurorum*, *sic & hoc*, p. 252. l. 3. r. *Membrum Corporis Christi*, p. 254. l. 17. r. *Quoniam*.

In the Appendix.

Page 275. l. 6. for *there*, r. *that*, p. 276. l. 22. r. *proved*, p. 319. mar. l. 4. r. *concessu S. Sedis*, p. 328. l. 2. r. *can bear*, p. 330. l. 4. blot out *Substance of*, p. 333. l. 20. r. *the Bread and Wine daily Consecrated*, p. 356. l. 10. r. *in the corporeal*, p. 359. l. 23. r. *these words*, p. 371. l. 1. r. *we* [*there*] *see*, p. 373. l. 18. r. *but that*, p. 386. mar. l. 1. r. *que* — p. 329. l. 6. r. *say that*, p. 426. mar. l. 9 r. *Species*, p. 468. l. ult. for *that* read *the*.

A Catalogue of some Books Sold by Thomas Boomer, *at the Chirurgeons Arms in* Fleetstreet, *near* Temple-Bar.

1. FOrty Sermons by the Right Reverend Father in God, *Ralph Brownrig*, late Lord Bishop of *Exeter*.

2. A Compleat History of *England*, from the first Entrance of the *Romans*, under the Conduct of *Julius Cæsar*, unto the end of the Reign of King *Henry* III. comprehending the *Roman*, *Saxon*, *Danish*, and *Norman* Affairs and Transactions in this Nation, during that time: Wherein is shewed the Original of our English Laws; the Differences and Disagreements between the Secular and Ecclesiastick Powers; The true Rise and Grounds of the Contentions and Wars between the *Romans* and our Antient Kings: And likewise an Account of our Foreign Wars with *France*, the Conquest of *Ireland*, and the Actions between the *English*, *Scots*, and *Welch*, during the same time; All delivered in plain Matter of

of Fact, without any Reflections or Remarks, by *Robert Brady*, Doctor of Physick.

3. The Parable of the Pilgrim, Written to a Friend, by *Simon Patrick*, D D. Dean of *Peterborough*, the 6th. Edition corrected.

4. *Mellificium Chirurgiæ*, or the Marrow of Chirurgery, an Anatomical Treatise: Institutions of Physick, with *Hippocrates* Aphorisms, largely Commented upon. The Marrow of Physick, shewing the Causes, Signs and Cures of most Diseases incident to Humane Bodies. Choice Experienced Receipts for the Cure of several Distempers. The fourth Edition enlarged with many Additions, and purged from many Faults that escaped in the former Impressions, Illustrated in its several parts, with 12. Brass Cuts, by *James Cook* of *Warwick*, Practitioner in Physick and Chyrurgery.

5. Certain Sermons and Homilies appointed to be Read in Churches, in the time of Q. *Elizabeth*, of Famous Memory, and now Reprinted for the Use of Private Families, in two Parts, in 12s.

11 JU 62